DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 425 649 FL 025 621

TITLE	Beyond Classroom Boundaries: Incorporating Context in Teaching.
INSTITUTION	California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
PUB DATE	1994-00-00
NOTE	95p.; Second "Theme" issue of this journal. For other theme issues, see FL 025 619 and FL 025 623.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT	CATESOL Journal; v7 n1 Spr 1994
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adjunct Faculty; Classroom Techniques; College Faculty; Curriculum Design; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Grading; Higher Education; Immigrants; Instructional Materials; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Language Teachers; Organizational Climate; Program Design; *Reading Instruction; Reflective Teaching; School Community Relationship; Second Language Instruction; Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Methods; *Workplace Literacy; *Writing Instruction

ABSTRACT

This English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) journal periodically devotes entire issues to specific issues. The theme of this issue is "Incorporating Context in Teaching." Articles include: "Learning Beyond the Classroom: Developing the Community Connection" (Tim Beard); "Smiling through the Turbulence: The Flight Attendant Syndrome and Other Issues of Writing Instructor Status in the Adjunct Model" (Lynn Goldstein, Cherry Campbell, Martha Clark Cummings); "Developing Communities of Reflective ESL Teacher-Scholars through Peer Coaching" (Kate Kinsella); "An Overview of the Rights of Immigrant Parents" (Peter Roos); "Putting Grading into Context: "From a Nightmare to a Learning Experience" (Katharine Davies Samway); "Collaboration across Disciplines in Postsecondary Education: Attitudinal Challenges" (Marguerite Ann Snow); and "Influences Beyond the Workplace ESL Classroom: The Relationship between Traditional, Transitional, and High Performance Organizations and Workplace ESL Teachers" (Lauren A. Vanett, Lois Facer). (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Donna M. Brinton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 425 649

The CATESOL Journal

Volume 7 · Number 1 · Spring 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The CATESOL Journal

VOLUME 7 • NUMBER 1 • SPRING 1994

CONTENTS

Spring 1994 Theme Issue

Beyond Classroom Boundaries: Incorporating Context in Teaching

Guest Editors:
Anne M. Katz and Tamara Lucas

ARTICLES

Learning Beyond the Classroom: Developing the Community Connection 9
Tim Beard

Smiling Through the Turbulence: The Flight Attendant Syndrome and Other Issues of Writing Instructor Status in the Adjunct Model 19
Lynn Goldstein, Cherry Campbell and Martha Clark Cummings

Developing Communities of Reflective ESL Teacher-Scholars Through Peer Coaching 31
Kate Kinsella

An Overview of the Rights of Immigrant Parents 49
Peter Roos

Putting Grading Into Context: From a Nightmare to a Learning Experience 53
Katharine Davies Samway

Collaboration Across Disciplines in Postsecondary Education: Attitudinal Challenges 59
Marguerite Ann Snow

Influences Beyond The Workplace ESL Classroom: The Relationship Between Traditional, Transitional, and High Performance Organizations and Workplace ESL Teachers 65
Lauren A. Vanett and Lois Facer

REVIEWS

The Missing Link: Workplace Education in Small Business
by Forrest Chisman
and
The Workplace Literacy Primer: An Action Manual for Training and Development Professionals
by William J. Rothwell and Dale C. Brandenburg 77
Reviewed by John Wiley and Marji Knowles

Language and Discrimination: A Study of Communications in Multiethnic Workplaces
by C. Roberts, E. Davies, and T. Jupp 81
Reviewed by Mary McGroarty

Immigrant America: A Portrait
by Alejandro Portes and Ruben G. Rumbaut 85
Reviewed by Katheryn Garlow

Language Planning and Social Change
by Robert L. Cooper 89
Reviewed by Erika L. Konrad

Planning Language, Planning Inequality
by James W. Tollefson 93
Reviewed by Susan Conrad

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS 97

The CATESOL Journal

Editors

Denise Murray, San Jose State University
Peter Master, California State University Fresno

Review Editor:
Elizabeth Leite, Mt. Diablo Unified School District

Editorial Advisory Board

David Eskey, University of Southern California
Alice Gosak, San Jose City College
Johnnie Johnson Hafernik, University of San Francisco
Ann Johns, San Diego State University
Donna Brinton, University of California, Los Angeles
Elizabeth Whalley, San Francisco State University
Anne Katz, ARC Associates

Credits

Copy Editing: Denise Mahon
Proofreading: Anne Katz
Keyboarding: Denise Mahon
Advertising: Paula Schiff
Design and Typesetting: CTA Graphics
Printing: Warren's Waller Press

Copyright © 1994
California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

The CATESOL Journal

1994-95 CATESOL BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President
DOROTHY S. MESSERSCHMITT

President-elect
GRETCHEN BITTERLIN

Past President
NATALIE KUHLMAN

Secretary
KAREN YOSHIHARA

Treasurer
JIM MARTUS

Elementary Level Chair
SARA FIELDS

Secondary Level Chair
BETH WINNINGHAM

Adult Level Chair
JOANNE ARING

Community College Level Chair
ANNE EDIGER

College/University Level Chair
VANESSA WENZELL

Chapter Council Chair
BARBARA BILDERBACK

Assistant Secretary
JANET LANE

Assistant Elementary Level Chair
ELVIRA RANGEL LAL

Assistant Secondary Level Chair
BARBARA THORNBURY

Assistant Adult Level Chair
MARNIE SCHWARTZ

Assistant Comm. College Chair
MARK LIEU

Assistant Coll./Univ. Chair
DANA FERRIS

Assistant Chapter Council Chair
MAYIS LEPAGE

CATESOL News
JACQUI PHILLIPS

CATESOL Journal
DENISE MURRAY
PETER MASTER

Advertising
PAULA SCHIFF

Publications
DENISE MAHON

Public Relations
PAM BUTTERFIELD

Conference Coordinator
KARA ROSENBERG

Conference Site Selection
MARJORIE KNOWLES
LYDIA STACK

Publishers' Exhibits
CHAN BOSTWICK

Intensive Workshops
JODY HACKER
MARGARET MANSON

Historian
KATHERYN GARLOW

Membership
ANN CREIGHTON

Nominations
JODY HACKER

Sociopolitical Concerns
LINDA SASSER

Teacher Education
JIM STACK

Professional Development
PAT BENNETT

CHAPTER COUNCIL

Kern Chapter Coordinator
CYNTHIA HAMMOND-SAALFIELD

Northern Nevada Chapter Coord.
AGNES DAMEON

Orange Chapter Coordinator
FAYE MILTENBERGER

Saroyan Chapter Coordinator
KAREN EISNER

Southeast Chapter Coordinator
KATHERYN Z. WEED

Southern Nevada Chapter Coord.
VICKI HOLMES

Steinbeck Chapter Coordinator
KRISTEN PRESTRIDGE

■ ***The CATESOL Journal*** is published annually. Subscriptions are not sold without membership. Back copies (single issues) are available from Warren Printing and Mailing, 5000 Eagle Rock Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90041.

■ Communication regarding permission to reprint must be addressed to Denise Murray, 7054 Calcaterra Drive, San Jose, CA 95120.

■ Advertising is arranged by Paula Schiff, ELS Language Center, 3510 Mountain Blvd., Oakland, CA 94619.

■ Membership inquiries should be directed to Ann Creighton, CATESOL Membership Chair, 1146 N. Central Avenue, #195, Glendale, CA 91202.

We are pleased to present the second theme-based special issue of *The CATESOL Journal.* Its focus on issues beyond the classroom provides a broad look at the challenges facing educators working with language minority students at all levels of education in California. We wish to thank Anne Katz and Tamara Lucas for responding to our challenge to develop this crucial issue. They completed their task with professionalism and enthusiasm.

Denise E. Murray
Coeditor

Peter Master
Coeditor

Guest Editors' Note

ESL professionals are accustomed to thinking about language not simply as discrete units but as complex, socially and psychologically created acts of communication embedded in a web of contextual features. We no longer believe that our students can become fluent users of English by practicing linguistic forms outside of a meaningful context. Indeed, many of us spend a great deal of time and energy designing instruction to reflect this broader conception of the teaching and learning of language.

Similarly, teaching is itself embedded in the world beyond the classroom, which, with all its details, gives the act of teaching its meaning. This volume of *The CATESOL Journal* focuses our attention on the wider context surrounding teaching. Drawing on their experiences as TESOL professionals in language classrooms, the contributors explore a variety of factors which propel their thinking about teaching and learning beyond the traditional boundaries of the ESL classroom and which impinge on and shape what goes on in the classroom. They examine such influences on classrooms as: community values, expectations, and resources; relationships and interactions among colleagues; limits and protections of the legal system; institutional structures (explicit and implicit); colleagues' attitudes, assumptions, and expectations; and teachers' perceptions of their roles with students, and colleagues, and within institutions and surrounding communities.

- Tim Beard explores learning beyond the classroom through connections with the community.
- Lynn Goldstein, Cherry Campbell, and Martha Clark Cummings explore issues of status and control in adjunct models of instruction.
- Kate Kinsella presents a model for developing communities of teacher-scholars through peer coaching that derives from reconceptualizing both staff development and preservice preparation of language teachers.

- Peter Roos delineates the rights of language minority students' parents.
- Katharine Davies Samway describes the challenges of implementing one's own ideas of teaching and learning within the constraints of university settings.
- Marguerite Ann Snow describes the attitudinal challenges of collaborating across disciplines in a university setting where content-area faculty require assistance in dealing with the instructional demands of teaching second language students.
- Lauren Vanett and Lois Facer discuss the relationship between traditional, transitional, and high-performance organizations and workplace ESL teachers.

In addition, book reviews provide a variety of resources for teachers who are dealing with the changing context of language teaching. Our reviewers have examined books that explore the changing workplace, social pressure, and racial biases affecting immigrants and language planning policies.

This thought-provoking sampling of teachers' insights and experiences reminds us that the boundaries between our classrooms and the world of which they are a part are not as real or as clearly drawn as we usually think.

Anne M. Katz and Tamara Lucas
Guest Editors

The CATESOL Journal

TIM BEARD
ARC Associates

Learning Beyond the Classroom: Developing the Community Connection

I learned that some people are very, very neat and others are very messy. I also learned that everyone had a different way of putting their stuff inside the tent. I also learned that some people were slowpokes and other people got up and ready in less than ten minutes. Other people would go slow walking and others were fast because they wanted to get there as soon as possible or other people would just walk kind of fast and kind of slow. I also learned that some people got surprised whenever they saw something and others didn't. I also learned that when some people saw a deer they would start screaming and shouting while other people would just look at the deer and watch quietly.

(Michelle Gonzales, 4th grade student, Melrose School)

The thing that surprised me the most was that there was a lot more to see than just the immigration and the forests. You could see the whole Bay Area from the top. You can find animals. You get to see footprints, and many more things that make you wonder.

(Violeta Soledad Obrera, 5th grade student, Melrose School)

As teachers struggle to understand and respond to an increasingly diverse student population, they have felt the need to transform their curriculum so that it recognizes and builds on this diversity in meaningful ways. The curriculum is particularly inadequate in reflecting the culture and voices of immigrant and language minority students: "Our old curriculum is too narrow. Immigrant children seldom find their own experiences or histories reflected anywhere in the classroom or the texts. This cre-

ates among them a sense of unreality and unimportance about their past ..." (Olsen, 1988, p. 68)

The search for an appropriate multicultural curriculum has focused a lot of attention on changes in both the content and process of teaching. For example, the language arts curriculum has been broadened by the integration of multicultural literature. Social studies textbooks have been revised to reflect a wider range of social, cultural, and historical information. Whole language and cooperative learning techniques have helped to build more effective learning processes in the classroom.

But in creating a curriculum which values diversity, teachers often miss one of the richest and most readily available resources – the real world beyond the classroom. This paper will present some examples of learning in which teachers and students have deliberately left the familiar world of the classroom and have built their curriculum upon real life people, places and issues in the surrounding community.

One of the best known models of the connection between the school and the community is an experiment known as Foxfire which has been carried on by students in northern Georgia for more than 20 years. In the Foxfire approach high school students engage in research on aspects of their own Appalachian culture and history and publish the results of their research in the form of magazines and books. The process goes beyond simply engaging the students in experiences of cultural journalism, though. It is grounded in the conviction that students must have a genuine voice in planning what happens in this process. Thus, it also emphasizes core practices such as community building, choice, democratic decision making, collaboration, and reflection.

The Foxfire process spirals out of classroom activities such as tape recorded interviews with local people, photo documentation, and searches of official records including newspapers and local archives. This information is brought back to the classroom in the form of sharing and discussions and leads to further activities such as transcribing, editing, photo developing, layout, and printing. Using the Foxfire approach, students have developed a deeper and more personal understanding of the lives and happenings of their local community while, at the same time, mastering the academic skills required by the state language arts curriculum.

Using Foxfire as a model, a group of teachers in Northern California has experimented with community-based projects at various grade levels over the past three years. Many of these projects have grown out of the need teachers have felt to respond more effectively to the diversity of languages and cultures in their classrooms. By reaching out beyond the classroom, the students have discovered new avenues for exploring diversity

through their connection to people, places, and experiences beyond the classroom. The result has been to change the way teachers and students look at themselves, the purpose of learning, and their relationship to the wider community.

The following is a description of three of the projects which have been carried out in bilingual and ESL classrooms.

Connecting to the Local Community: Gum Moon Women's Residence

This project was undertaken as part of a three-week Chinese immersion program for students of Chinese ethnicity during a summer at Commodore Stockton Elementary School in San Francisco. The 25 students in a second grade class received all of their instruction in Chinese. The teacher, Annie Ching, wanted the students to develop a sense of identity and pride in their culture through a study of their community.

Since only half of the students were from the local neighborhood, the teacher suggested looking at local landmarks as a way for them to begin to explore the community. One of the landmarks was the Gum Moon Women's Residence, an old brick building across the street which the students passed every day on their way to school but knew nothing about.

In preparation for a field trip to the residence, the teacher wrote the students' questions and initial observations on a chart. There was a lot of discussion, especially around the issue of gender – Why didn't men live there? Would boys be allowed to go into the residence? The teacher then helped the students organize themselves into teams and prepare a list of questions they would ask at Gum Moon.

The visit to the residence provided an opportunity for the students to see inside the building, meet some of the women, and learn a little about the history of the residence. They discovered that Gum Moon was a boarding house for women (mainly recently arrived immigrants from China) and that it had been in operation since 1912. The students were fascinated by the old pictures of girls and women dressed in different style clothes. They asked questions about the daily life of the residents – their food, their chores, their communal living situation, their English classes. They were surprised to find that some of the women had children and that child care was provided at the residence while the women attended English classes.

The classroom activities following the visit spiraled in several directions. The teams filled chart paper with the things they learned about the residence and its history. They developed lists in English and Chinese of new words they had learned during the visit and solved math problems (about time) which arose out of their discussions of the past. Each team

made drawings and wrote descriptions in English of the rooms of the residence and compiled these in a book which they shared with the class next door. Finally, they repeated the process, developing the book in Chinese, and made copies which they presented personally to the Gum Moon residents. They also made copies for the principal and other teachers in the school.

The teacher felt that the project helped build a bridge between school and the outside world, making the students more aware of their own local history as well as helping them to develop a personal relationship with the elders in their community. She was told by the receptionist at Gum Moon that as far as she could remember this was the first time students had ever visited the residence, an amazing fact considering that the residence is just across the street from the school. In summing up the benefits of this experience, the teacher remarked, "We often miss the best resources and greatest learning opportunities right in front of our eyes. It only took a little spark to make this project happen and it was a real cultural connection for us all."

Connecting to the Larger World: Angel Island Project

This was a year-long project carried out by two teachers, Suzanne McCombs and Chris Ashley, with two groups of fourth and fifth grade students at Melrose Elementary School in Oakland. The instructional programs in which the teachers and students participated included a bilingual curriculum in Spanish and English, primary language support in Cambodian and Vietnamese, and sheltered learning across the curriculum.

The teachers decided to build on a project they had begun the year before: an exploration of immigration through the experience of the Chinese who passed through the immigration station on Angel Island. The teachers began by taking small groups of students for exploratory trips out to the island on weekends. There they met volunteers from the Angel Island Association, who took them under their wing, showing them around the detention center, and sharing their stories and knowledge of history with them. The students developed a personal relationship with the volunteers which grew throughout the year.

As the students became more familiar with the island and its history, they organized themselves into five research teams – history/geography, immigration, environmental studies, oral history, and camping. Their work inside and outside of the classroom included interviews, reading and writing, and math, science, and art activities. Each team explored specific questions and ideas related to their area of research. Other activities revolved around making the connection between the past and the present. The stu-

dents memorized poems (in translation) inscribed on the barracks walls. They interviewed their own family members about personal stories of migration and immigration. They wrote letters and made phone calls to various resources seeking additional information. They wrote daily math story problems relating to all aspects of the project. And they discussed the social and political situations of immigrants in the U.S. today. The project culminated with a three-day camping trip to the island, the creation of a quilt which was presented to the Angel Island Association, and the donation of $250 which the students raised to support activities at the immigration station.

Although there were no Chinese American students in the class, the unfair treatment of Chinese immigrants at the detention center elicited a deep response from the students, many of whom were immigrants themselves. They wrote poems and stories in English and Spanish adopting the voices of people who were detained on the island and relating the experience to their own lives:

Instead of remaining a citizen of Africa
I came to America to make a decent living.
But who am I fooling?
The American just took me,
Locked me up.
They kept me
In a cruel, filthy, dark room.
What can I do?
I just keep wondering and wondering
Why do they have me locked up?
Is it because I am black?

(Jermaine Brown, 5th grade)

We are the people
From thousand miles,
We are the people
Who mean no harm,
From deep ocean
Through steep mountains rank,
We walk and run
We're looking for and searching for
The beauty of life,
The best quality of life.
Through fearness and sadness
We go,

We hope and believe
There is a place
That give us hope,
Give us freedom.
We are the people
We are immigrant
Who come to a place
That's called America.

(Sophiden Hak, 5th grade)

One of the consequences of this extensive project was the development of new relationships both inside and outside the classroom. The many group experiences outside the classroom allowed teachers and students to get to know one another beyond their classroom personas. The adoption of the students by the island volunteers also deepened the relationship between the students and the volunteers and led to other opportunities such as a display of the students' work at the immigration center, personal tours of the island, and invitations to attend special events and ceremonies at the immigration center. Along the way, too, the teachers and students received encouragement, support, and participation from the principal and other staff at the school, parents, and community organizations.

In describing some of the results of this intensive community experience, the teachers commented:

> The community connection helps students become active, engaged learners. Because students do real work for and with real people, work that has a real effect on themselves and others, learning is connected to them in a personal way. Students become teachers and learners, finding out that classrooms aren't the only source for learning. They find that learning is something that you pursue, go out and find wherever it is, whether inside or outside of school.

Connecting to the School Community: Studying American Culture

This project was carried out in an intermediate ESL class of 20 students (9th to 12th grade) at El Molino High School in Forestville. The teacher, Lynn Stewart, wanted to find a way to give her students a better understanding of American culture and provide opportunities for them to have more interactions with the rest of the school. Her idea was to draw on the students and staff of the school and bring them into the ESL curriculum as cultural resources.

In response to the question, "What do you want to know about American culture?" the students listed more than 20 topics, including holidays, football and the presidential election. The teacher then proposed that they invite different people from the school to come to the class and speak on each of the topics. After much discussion, hesitation, journal writing, more discussion, and group decision making, the students decided to conduct interviews and document the sessions through photography, audio recording, and video recording.

The teacher then guided the students to make preparations for each interview. They worked in small groups to brainstorm their questions on each topic and draft letters of invitation. Then the whole class refined the questions and wrote a composite letter of invitation which they personally delivered to the interviewees. In addition to developing the communicative skills which they needed to use in the process – for example, writing invitation and thank you letters, asking questions, building a broad range of vocabulary – the students also learned to operate cameras, tape recorders, and camcorders.

Before each interview, a student team volunteered to conduct the interview, taking on roles such as interviewer, photographer, and recorder. Throughout the year most of the students had an opportunity to participate in all of these roles. After each interview, the class debriefed the session, discussing, asking further questions, and writing new insights about American culture. The students kept journals in which they wrote their feelings about the project, describing their nervousness before interviewing and their pride in a job well done afterwards. They also created a class culture portfolio, an album of photos and written descriptions of each interview which became their learning record for the semester.

Reflecting on the accomplishments of this project, the teacher described several results:

> The benefits were incredible. In the past I taught ESL strictly within the confines of the classroom with no chance for the students to use what they learned in real life situations. They progress so slowly when they have no real audience to communicate with. Not only did my students speak more English than ever before through this project, but they learned a lot about American schools, American teenagers, and American culture. After the project I continued to see the ripple effects spreading outward. My students were speaking to other students on campus; the school staff was no longer frightening to them. In fact, four students became itinerant cameramen, videotaping activities in other classrooms at teachers' requests.

Four Qualities of the Community Connection

Despite the differences in language, grade level, and curriculum content, these classroom examples share four qualities that are at the heart of the community connection: (a) a greater variety of resources in language and culture, (b) a broadening of the curriculum, (c) the development of relationships, and (d) a deepening of the quality of learning.

As students are guided to look beyond the teacher and books for their sources of learning, they open themselves up to a wider variety of linguistic and cultural resources in the real world. By exploring through interviews, community artifacts, and lived experiences, students are exposed to authentic forms of language and culture with all their complexities and contradictions. In interactions with the elders of Gum Moon, students had opportunities to deepen their primary language and discover new vocabulary, new concepts, and new perspectives. In cross-language interactions with the El Molino school community, ESL students were able to stretch themselves to the outer limits of their linguistic competence in English because of the communicative importance of the experience.

As the learning frame of reference expands beyond the classroom, the traditional categories of subject areas or disciplines dissolve in favor of a more holistic view. In their explorations of Angel Island, for example, students grappled with complex issues of time, place, legal systems, culture, and human understanding. The resulting poetry, math problems, art work, and interest in current events integrated the issues into a whole and provided a broader context for discovering the interrelated nature of knowledge.

Connections to people are one of the most tangible features of the experience beyond the classroom. The students' development of relationships is central to the community connection and takes many different forms. First and foremost this relationship was reflected in a deepened sense of community among the teachers and students. New connections were also built cross-generationally, as with the residents of Gum Moon or the volunteers on Angel Island; cross-culturally, as with the larger school community at El Molino; and across both culture and time, as with the connection to Chinese immigrants on Angel Island. These relationships are both the vehicle for and the object of learning. The connections with people begin with the students valuing the community as a vital resource and end with the community valuing the students and their work.

Finally, the community connection changes the way teachers and students view the learning process. By looking to the community as their text and engaging in activities without predetermined outcomes, students open themselves to discoveries about the world and themselves which are powerful learning experiences. One of the students in the Melrose class, Josefina

Alvarez, designed and produced on her own an Angel Island ABC Book, which is being considered for publication by the Angel Island Association. This self-initiated project shows what is possible when students are given the freedom to see themselves not as objects but as subjects of their learning and when the products of this learning are recognized and valued by the community.

The four walls of the classroom shut out experiences which can infuse the curriculum with life and give it a deeper purpose. The community connection breaks through the walls and brings new resources and perspectives to bear on the needs and interests of a diverse student population. ■

References

Olsen, Laurie. (1988). *Crossing the Schoolhouse Border: Immigrant Students and the California Public Schools*. San Francisco: California Tomorrow.

Further Reading

Haney, Cheryl I. (1993, Spring). Personal and family history in the classroom. *Hands On: A Journal for Teachers, 47*, 37-39.

Sitton, Thad, Mehhafy, George L., & Davis, Jr., O.L. (1983). *Oral History: A Guide for Teachers and Others*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Wigginton, Eliot. (1991/1992). Culture begins at home. *Educational Leadership, 49* (4), 60-64.

The CATESOL Journal

LYNN GOLDSTEIN, CHERRY CAMPBELL
and MARTHA CLARK CUMMINGS
Monterey Institute of International Studies

Smiling Through the Turbulence: The Flight Attendant Syndrome and Other Issues of Writing Instructor Status in the Adjunct Model

In examining any pedagogical theory, it is important to consider the settings in which the theory is implemented as well as the constraints inherent in those settings. For example, many practitioners advocate the use of adjunct-model writing courses as a means of helping students learn content at the same time that they learn to write academic papers for these content courses. In the adjunct model, the students who attend, for example, a writing course offered by the ESL department also attend a content course such as political science or second language acquisition offered by another academic department. The writing course focuses on the genres students need to use in the content course and, among other writing activities, uses the actual papers assigned in the content course as a means of helping students master these genres. On the whole, however, the literature on adjunct-based writing courses does not emphasize factors that impinge upon the success of such courses. In our collective experience in teaching adjunct writing courses in a variety of settings, we have found that certain factors can have serious consequences.

What follows are some observations of difficulties that teachers may encounter in implementing adjunct writing courses in higher education. We will not be describing a particular adjunct-model course but will generalize from our experiences teaching a number of such courses, particularly from those in which we encountered problems. We will refer to teacher and student journals and particular examples of courses to illustrate issues where appropriate. We will begin from the point of view of the university student, for clarity's sake, but we recognize that student and teacher issues are inherently intertwined.

Student Issues

The literature expounding content-based language courses tells us that content-based language courses are intrinsically motivating for students (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989; Leaver & Stryker, 1989). The adjunct model predicts that students will be writing about content that is meaningful to them, at the very least because it is content that they need to understand in order to be successful in their companion content course (Goldstein, 1993). Consider, however, situations like those we have encountered where the content course seems either irrelevant or uninteresting to students. Students might be required to attend a content course which they may find interesting, but which they may not perceive as relevant to their degree program, for example an exciting breadth course (e.g., a course not in their major). On the other hand, students might find themselves attending a content course which they do find relevant to their degree program but which does not interest them, for example a dull required course in their major. It is our experience that when students attend a writing course adjuncted to a content course which the students consider irrelevant or uninteresting, the resistance to the content course can lead to considerable resistance in the writing course. As one teacher noted in her journal, "Every time I've ever taught an adjunct or content-based course, there have been complaints about the content." A student remarked in a journal entry, "It's really frustrating. I am push into a class and the instructor teach to me something I do not want any help with. I need grammar, spelling, organization not more of political science course."

Students also bring expectations from their previous academic experience about what their writing courses should cover. (See, for example, Valentine & Repath-Martos, 1992). We have found in some instances that students expect a "standard" writing class which covers a range of genres applicable to a variety of disciplines rather than a subset of genres applicable to only one discipline or course. In addition, we have seen that, as Valentine and Repath-Martos (1992) have found, in some instances, students expect the course to focus heavily on grammar and vocabulary. They may balk at being limited to in-depth study of specific types of writing related to their content course and may also feel that they are, therefore, not receiving appropriate generalized instruction. One student in an adjunct writing class stated concern in an evaluation, "I do not know if you realize it or you are doing it specifically, but it seems we are being taught the principles of political science rather than conventional English writing." For example, in a writing class for native and nonnative speakers enrolled in a required political science research course, we met a lot of resistance to working on the particular writing assignments of the course. Students

viewed these papers as unique to this policy course and wanted instead to work on genres that they perceived as being applicable to a wider range of courses. Some students came away feeling that the instruction they received was inappropriate or not helpful beyond the confines of this particular combination of writing and content courses.

Another issue of concern is students' trust in the adjunct writing course. Certainly we can see from the above discussion that this trust can be undermined when students believe that they are not receiving adequate writing instruction. Of equal concern is the students' sense of who has authority over the content that is being taught in the content course. Traditionally, the academy has vested that authority in the content teacher, and writing teachers have taken pains not to tread on this authority. The adjunct model, however, makes this issue of authority central since students are writing papers in the adjunct writing course which focus on the content of the companion course. And, following current pedagogical practices, we teach and respond in ways that demonstrate that the writing is not separable from the content. (See Shih, 1986, for example). Adjunct writing teachers, therefore, find themselves having to both know the content and respond to the content in students' papers. While the writing teacher may feel confident that she or he does know the content and can respond to the use of that content in the students' papers, students are not always so willing to vest this authority in their writing teachers.

> I do believe the class is helping an awful lot in sharpening my political science writing skills. There is no doubt about that. The doubt is how well, you, an English instructor, can disseminate and give feedback on my political science writing ... I realize that the main purpose of this course, is to hone my skills at political science writing. But let's make a distinction here – it is simply improving writing skills and definitely not imparting knowledge about the principles of political science, for that is the forte of political science faculty members.
>
> (excerpt from a student evaluation)

This lack of trust on the part of the students can be further exacerbated when the writing teacher is learning the content along with the students by attending the content course. Students may even wonder if their teacher knows the content as well as they do or feel that their writing teacher is just "one step ahead." A teacher wrote in her journal , "[A student] wondered if and why the institution was going to keep making its English teachers teach things they don't know anything about."

The issue of authority also leads to another concern expressed by students in adjunct writing courses: serving two masters. In some instances, we have seen students confused by what they perceive as differing expectations on the part of the writing teacher and the content teacher. Unless the writing teacher and the content teacher share knowledge and perceptions about writing processes, products, responses, evaluation and assessment, then students can be left feeling that they are receiving conflicting messages about what is important in their writing and how that will be evaluated. In a number of instances, students have been thoroughly dismayed by the disparity between the responses of the writing teacher, who focuses on process as well as product and responds to and evaluates rhetoric, content, and language, and the responses of the content teacher who focuses on product and evaluates solely on content and/or language.

> She [the student] told me after class that she was really angry at JA [content teacher] because she had given him a draft of her critique and he had said it was all right, he had even marked it "good" in places (I have a copy) and then when he gave it back to her he had given her an A- (a low grade for her) and told her the policy evaluation was all wrong. Step 10 she got all wrong. So what is she supposed to do/think? Why didn't he tell her it was all wrong when he read the draft? He wasn't reading carefully, that's why.
>
> (excerpt from an adjunct instructor's diary)

In sum, from the students' point of view, adjunct courses are not always as effective as we might believe or hope. Students perceive them as working well when these courses fit their expectations about what a writing course should be and do, when they are invested in the content of the content course, and when they trust the writing teacher's control of the content and feel that their writing teacher and content teacher are in sync. Too often, however, we find ourselves in situations where some combination of the above factors is not present, and students are left feeling that they are not receiving the kind of instruction that will help them become better writers.

Teacher Issues

> One of the things that really upsets me about adjunct writing courses in general and this one in particular is that it makes me feel like a flight attendant. I keep picturing us in our little uniforms going up and down the aisles, taking care of the student-passengers, while the big boys fly the plane. We rattle down the aisle of a 747 handing out plastic wrapped chicken

> sandwiches, smiling through the turbulence, while the big professors sit up in the cockpit. The question is: Aren't we giving up our authority over our own 'content' by doing this? Pretty soon we'll be bringing them coffee, too. Won't we?
>
> (excerpt from an adjunct writing instructor's journal)

As this diary excerpt illustrates, adjunct writing teachers may have difficulty with authority, with status and rank. But this is not only a problem for this particular kind of course. More often than not, writing courses are considered "skill" courses by most members of the academy and although learning to write is considered important, it is still only a skill. As Rose (1985) puts it, "It is absolutely necessary but remains second-class" (p.347). In addition, language learning in general and ESL in particular are often categorized as skill courses and not as important in the university hierarchy as content courses. Auerbach (1991) has argued that, "A fact of life for ESL educators is that we are marginalized. The official rationalization for our marginal status is that ESL is a skill, not a discipline ..." (p.1). A writing course for ESL students, then, is doubly marginalized in the eyes of the rest of the university faculty and administration.

In the case of adjunct-model courses, often the writing course is taught by a part-time instructor and the content course by an associate or full professor. In one case we know of, two deans were teaching the content course. This is a fact that has been variously dealt with. Johns (1989) suggests accepting the asymmetry between the content course and the adjuncted writing course and using activities in the writing class such as "summaries of lectures and/or readings" and "listing important vocabulary and its relevance to the course." Benesch (1992), on the other hand, states that

> Paired arrangements can easily turn the ESL class into a tutoring service which sustains large classes, one-way lectures, incomprehensible textbooks, and coverage of massive amounts of material. Rather than acting as support for this type of instruction, we should be fighting for smaller classes, a more interactive teaching approach, and better readings. We can model a more appropriate style of teaching in ESL classes, including small group discussion, journals, student-generated questions, and we can work with our colleagues in other disciplines to implement these methods. (p.8)

Johns and Benesch represent the two ends on the continuum of teacher attitudes toward the place of ESL writing courses in the model of paired or adjunct courses. A prospective ESL adjunct writing-course instructor needs to seriously consider how much status and authority in the context of the

university she needs to have to function adequately in the classroom before embarking on this kind of teaching.

We have found that the belief still persists among content instructors that writing instruction is a skill that can be learned through memorizing rules and applying them. That is, these professors expect

> that writing courses will address sentence-level concerns whereas [writing] instructors emphasize a process approach to writing wherein audience, purpose, organization, and development of ideas are primary concerns. Grammatical or sentence-level issues are addressed only after audience, purpose, organization and development are clearly addressed (Choi, Cramp, Goldsborough, Nashiro, & Tuman, 1993, p.5).

Comments we have heard from content instructors on what is important in writing instruction include:

1. Student writers use too many *ing* -words.
2. I tell students to look at every *the* and see if they can strike it.
3. Only quote quotes.
4. Not to spell check is rude.

A further complication is that some content instructors feel that writing instructors should limit their remarks to sentence-level grammatical and mechanical issues. That is, writing instructors have no business making suggestions on students' ideas, since they are not experts on the course content. On the other hand, most writing teachers, educated by Halliday and Hasan (1976), think of a text as a semantic unit, a unit of meaning, not form. It is therefore virtually impossible for them to disregard content in their writing instruction, since disregarding content would mean disregarding the text.

Finally, if and when writing instructors attempt to share their expertise, it is often not appreciated by content instructors. In fact, more often than not, content instructors behave as if there is no content in writing classes, as if writing were something any well-educated person could teach. Often they seem to hold the attitude that writing, like riding a bicycle or driving a car, is a means to an end we all use but a tedious skill to teach and one they have no interest in participating in. Often it does not even seem to occur to them that they could participate in their students' development as writers.

Even though content holds this importance for them, adjunct writing instructors will never understand the content to the same degree as the content instructors (with the exception of those writing instructors who are

degreed in another field besides applied linguistics, TESOL, language education, etc.). Nor should they. The task of content-based instruction is to make explicit "the assumptions, conventions, and procedures of [the particular] discourse communities" (Eskey, 1992, p.19). Indeed, adjunct writing instructors should take on the role of discourse analysts, working with the content instructors and course material to determine the written discourse parameters of that discipline. Some previous research in this area may be helpful, research carried out primarily by ESP specialists, for example, Bazerman, 1984; Dudley-Evans and Henderson, 1990; Johns, 1991; and Swales, 1990. But for the most part, adjunct writing instructors need to investigate the discourse of the disciplines of their content assignments themselves as part of their own course development.

This is no easy task. They face at least two difficult obstacles. First, regardless of their attempts to inform themselves, adjunct writing instructors face the problems discussed above regarding students' mistrust of their authority vis-à-vis content instructors. Such mistrust can become contagious, infecting the writing instructors' own self confidence. This is illustrated in the following diary excerpt by a writing instructor whose course was adjuncted to a political science research methods course:

> Today in class I was totally stumped by a student question: Do we just have to take concepts, operationalize them, and thereby turn them into variables? Before this question came, I thought I understood concepts and variables completely. The student jolted me into realizing I didn't know how operationalization related the two together. And that after preparing a writing lesson on operationalization! I've got to go back to the political science material after all—wonder what else I don't yet understand completely!?!
>
> [The next day:] Yikes! Have I got *concept*-phobia now that I found out from my student that I didn't realize how operationalization affects concepts & variables? Here on page 23 of the political science textbook there's a discussion of whether concepts have to be observable or not. I had to read and reread over and over. I guess concepts have to at least be indirectly observable – a concept's empirical referents allow us to observe it at least indirectly. I guess even if it's not directly observable, it should still be precise and theoretically important. Okay, that should be good enough understanding of that – calm down, and try not to panic like that.
>
> (excerpt from an adjunct writing instructor's teaching journal)

A second obstacle involves writing instructors eliciting content information from their content colleagues. The writing instructors may find that content instructors, not being discourse analysts themselves, are often not able to articulate the discourse expectations of their fields readily. Their language awareness of the discourse patterns of their fields is lacking, even though their general understanding of the content of their fields may be excellent. Their responses to questions about what the writing is like in their fields tend to reflect their views of academic writing per se, as discussed above, for example, expectations of organization, and grammatical and orthographical correctness. Thus, adjunct writing instructors need to acquire enough knowledge of the content to be able to discuss specific issues of discourse expectations with the content instructors.

We have found it futile to ask content instructors in the field of policy studies the extent to which they define terms in their writing and the extent to which they expect their students to do so. However, when we have asked about the need to define specific terms like *civil strife* or *agenda-setting* within the field of political science, we have found ourselves in the midst of a fruitful discussion on the discourse of defining terms. Likewise, content instructors need to be prepared to work with the adjunct writing instructors introspectively and analytically to help build an understanding of the discourse of their discipline. The discussion and analysis carried out between adjunct writing and content instructors may need to cover discourse parameters of professional writing in the field as well as university student writing, in order for the writing instructor to determine a pedagogical discourse grammar, if you will, appropriate for the particular adjunct course. Not that they should, but even if adjunct writing instructors immersed themselves in lectures, professional reading material, and sample student papers regarding the course content, they might still be unable to develop an insider's understanding of the discourse unless they discussed what they observed with the content instructors as members of that discourse community.

Just as adjunct writing instructors need to learn the discourse of the content area, so also do content instructors need to learn aspects of our field of writing pedagogy in order to provide complementary instruction to our common students. Our primary concern is that content instructors respond to student writing during the writing process in a manner that corresponds pedagogically to our manner of response to writing. Naturally, we also hope that content instructors will assess final drafts of papers in ways that correspond to our assessments. We need to develop with the content instructors a common understanding of the expectations of the discourse community that we are teaching, sharing views on guiding students during their writing processes, responding to student work in progress, and assessing final papers.

As anyone who has been involved in writing-across-the-curriculum knows, writing instructors can come up against content instructors who consider it their responsibility merely to present writing assignments, answer questions if students come for help in office hours, and put letter grades along with a few justifying remarks on final papers. What needs to occur in the adjunct model is serious communication between adjunct writing instructors and content instructors regarding many issues, for example, (a) the types of written discourse the students should be working on, (b) the most appropriate ways to clarify writing assignments, (c) the types of difficulties students are experiencing in writing various assignments, (d) characteristics of both excellent and inadequate papers from the content instructor's perspective and ways to clarify this for the students well before final drafts are due, (e) given specific assignments, the areas which adjunct writing instructors should help students with and the areas the content instructor should help students with, and (f) what the adjunct writing teacher should assess and what the content teacher should assess.

Clearly, what we are suggesting here – developing an understanding of the discourse community at hand as well as sharing a common view of writing pedagogy – requires work from both the content instructor and the writing instructor. We are calling for reciprocal communication regarding entire fields of academic thought. This type of communication cannot be accomplished during a couple of meetings before the term begins but requires consistent communication throughout the course. It has already been noted in the literature that a most important factor assuring the success of an adjunct language program is regularly scheduled meeting time with content and language instructors, meeting time which is paid and scheduled at a time of the working day when all instructors have plenty of energy (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989; Mundahl, 1993). Without paid, rested time, meaningful communication cannot occur among content and adjunct language instructors; neither can communication take place successfully if the status of the adjunct writing instructor remains marginal. Boundaries need to be crossed by both the adjunct writing instructors and the content instructors such that the pedagogical responsibility and authority for writing and content is shared.

Concluding Remarks

Teachers need to approach adjunct courses with caution. In the best of circumstances, adjunct courses are a powerful means by which we can integrate content and writing instruction. They can allow us to open doors to the academic world for our students, helping them to understand the content and discourse of the communities within which they are learning and

to become more effective writers within that community. The best of circumstances, however, are often difficult to find. Institutional parameters find many of us working under conditions that do not easily lend themselves to sound adjunct courses. We are suggesting that ESL writing teachers be wary of situations in which they have lower status, in which the content teachers do not value the writing teacher's content nor attempt to learn it, in which the institution does not support the adjunct model by providing paid time for collaboration, in which there is not common ground for teaching and responding to writing between the content and writing teacher, or in which the students themselves are not vested in the content or the adjunct model. We are not suggesting that teachers avoid these situations, but we do believe that for the adjunct model to work, these conditions must be overcome. In the end, working under such conditions is not only demoralizing to students and teachers alike, it ends up separating what is inherently inseparable – content and writing. ■

References

Auerbach, E. (1991). Politics, pedagogy, and professionalism: Challenging marginalization in ESL. *College ESL, 1*(1), 1-9.

Bazerman, C. (1984). Modern evolution of the experimental report in physics: Spectroscopic articles in *Physical Review*, 1893–1980. *Social Studies in Science, 14*, 163-196.

Benesch, S. (1992). Sharing responsibilities: An alternative to the adjunct model. *College ESL, 2*, 1-10.

Brinton, D., Snow, M.A., & Wesche, M.B. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction.* New York: Newbury House/Harper & Row.

Choi, E., Cramp, M., Goldsborough, J., Nashiro, R. & Tuman, J. (1993). *BA writes needs analysis.* Unpublished paper for Curriculum Design, Monterey Institute of International Studies.

Dudley-Evans, A., & Henderson, W. (Eds.). (1990). *The language of economics: The analysis of economics discourse* (ELT Documents No. 134). London: Modern English Publications in association with the British Council.

Eskey, D.E. (1992). Syllabus design in content-based instruction. *CATESOL Journal*, 5, 11-23.

Goldstein, L. (1993). Becoming a member of the "teaching foreign language" community: Integrating reading and writing through an adjunct/content course. In J. Carson & I. Leki (Eds.).*Reading in the Composition Classroom: Second Language Perspectives.* (pp. 290-298). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman Group Ltd.

Johns, A.M. (1989, March). English for academic purposes course design: The issue of transferable skills. Paper presented at the meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, San Antonio, TX.

Johns, A.M. (1991). Interpreting an English competency examination: The frustrations of an ESL science student. *Written Communication, 8*, 379–401.

Leaver, B.L., & Stryker, S.B. (1989). Content-based instruction for foreign language classrooms. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22, 269–275.

Mundahl, J. (1993, April). *Educating teachers for content-based language instruction.* Panel presentation at the meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Atlanta, GA.

Rose, M. (1985). The language of exclusion: Writing instruction at the university. *College English, 47* (4), 341–359.

Shih, M. (1986). Content-based approaches to teaching academic writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 617–648.

Swales, J.M. (1990). *Genre analysis.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Valentine Jr., J.F., & Repath-Martos, L.M. (1992). How relevant is relevance?: An examination of student needs, interests, and motivation in the content-based university classroom. *CATESOL Journal, 5*, 25–42.

The CATESOL Journal

KATE KINSELLA
San Francisco State University and ARC Associates

Developing Communities Of Reflective ESL Teacher-Scholars Through Peer Coaching

Individuals entering or continuing in the teaching profession across the state of California face a paradox. Their credential and graduate school preservice training is generally inadequate to prepare them to confidently and competently enter today's classroom. Furthermore, inservice opportunities may actually fossilize rather than foster professional growth by failing to provide for teachers exemplary models to emulate and opportunities to engage in reflective practice, collegiality, and shared leadership. At the same time, these teachers are charged with the responsibility of educating a student population that is daily becoming strikingly more diverse with regard to home language and culture, learning and working styles, socio-economic privilege, and degree of social and academic preparation for school success.

Providing effective preservice or inservice training for California's educators in order to better serve such a diverse and changing student population is a formidable challenge for both teachers and administrators. When we ask faculty across the content areas and grade levels to embrace innovative approaches to language, literacy, and concept development for nonnative English speakers such as cooperative classroom structures or specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE), we are not simply asking them to fine tune existing knowledge and skills. We are asking them to adopt instructional approaches that require a fundamental reconsideration of underlying issues of educational access and equity, power and privilege, and individual professional responsibility.

Professional development of this magnitude requires an approach that challenges and integrally involves teachers in the creation and validation of their own knowledge. Current professional development efforts, however, are frequently inadequate to affect long-lasting, significant changes. One day or half-day inservices, regardless of the charisma, credibility and exper-

tise of the trainer, do little to assist and sustain meaningful professional growth. Conferences in specific subject matter fall equally short of addressing educators' needs for complex and ongoing learning about culturally pluralistic pedagogy. In most cases, the rhetoric of instructional innovation touted in the inservice or conference presentation and the initial enthusiasm with which teachers leave the session surpass the reality of institutional or classroom change.

Professional Development and Transfer of Training

Few new or experienced teachers, despite the best of intentions, can move from either a conference workshop or a more intensive staff development program directly into the classroom and begin implementing a new approach with noteworthy success. To acquire even moderately difficult instructional approaches, many teachers need as much as 20 to 30 hours of instruction in its theory, 15 to 20 demonstrations, and an additional 10 to 15 feedback sessions to apply what they have learned (Shalaway, 1985). Programs or innovations that require major revisions in the way teachers presently organize their curriculum and conduct their classes are unlikely to be implemented very well, if at all (Doyle & Ponder, 1977). Predictably improbable is immediate or appropriate use of strategies which require new ways of thinking about learning objectives, and the processes by which students with diverse linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds may each achieve those objectives and be fairly assessed.

In most cases, teachers need considerable time and experimentation to fit the sociolinguistically and politically grounded practices we expose them to in teacher education courses or staff development sessions focusing on instruction for bilingual/bicultural students to their unique pedagogical premises and classroom conditions. Even when professional development includes clear modeling followed by a hands-on practical component, any skill developed in training does not appear sufficient to sustain actual classroom practice with more complex models of teaching. Instead, nearly all classroom practitioners need social support as they labor through the transfer of training process (Showers, Joyce, & Bennett, 1987).

Berman and McLaughlin (1976) introduced the concept of *mutual adaptation* to describe the process by which teachers try out new practices, then adapt and modify them to fit their unique teaching contexts. These Rand researchers found that both the new instructional practices and the classroom setting into which they were brought were gradually changed, but that when staff development sessions were spaced over time, the likelihood of successful implementation and mutual adaptation was far greater. A one-shot workshop (even if the workshop extends over two or three con-

secutive days) does not allow for any period of trial and experimentation or for mutual adaptation. Teachers thus need adequate exposure to the major tenets of a new instructional approach and effective modeling along with time for classroom application.

Another indispensable feature of this fitting process must be opportunities for teachers to do detailed and continuing analyses of their teaching in a context that is both supportive and nonjudgmental yet personally and intellectually stimulating. Goldenberg and Gallimore (1991) maintain that professional development must be "grounded in the mundane but very real details of teachers' daily work lives and in a form that provides the intellectual stimulation of a graduate seminar" (p. 69-70). Certainly, teachers need ongoing guidance and validation to make successful adaptations of new instructional practices to their specific content areas and the special needs of their students.

Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation

Indeed, new school programs and innovations have been found to be most successful when teachers have regular opportunities to meet to discuss their classroom experiences in an atmosphere of collegiality and experimentation (Little, 1982). For most teachers, having a chance to share perspectives, raise questions, and seek solutions to common problems is extremely beneficial. In fact, what teachers appear to appreciate most about professional development is not the actual training, regardless of the expertise of the facilitator or relevancy of the topic, but the opportunity to explore issues and workplace challenges with colleagues (Holly, 1982). Since the power and attraction of staff development appears to lie in the opportunity to interact with fellow teachers, the vital role of follow-up collegial dialogue and positive reinforcement for participants in professional development activities cannot be overemphasized. It is as crucial as the preceding introduction to innovative practices and supporting theory through training. As Guskey (1986) persuasively points out, "Since ... changes (in teacher attitudes and beliefs) occur mainly *after* implementation takes place and evidence of improved student learning is gained, it is continued support *following* the initial training that is most crucial" (p. 10).

Unfortunately, few teaching contexts have strong structures to support the norms of collegiality and experimentation so vital to professional growth and renewal. Frequently, the sociology of a school or a particular department discourages colleagues from soliciting help or offering assistance to fellow teachers. The milieu of many schools fosters isolation, not interaction, and independence, not team orientation. Teachers largely work alone, in their classrooms and offices, some out of desire and some out of

necessity. A new faculty member may work in isolation, not yet having formed comfortable collegial relationships; other novice and veteran teachers may feel that to seek advice actively on curriculum, instruction, or classroom management is admitting a lack of competence and a potential threat to their professional status. Consequently, the critical decisions many faculty members make about teaching and learning stem more from their solitary reflection than from dialogue with trusted and respected colleagues.

Given the challenges of equitably serving California's diverse student learners, often without adequate or appropriate professional support, it is no wonder that many teachers vacillate between the impression that what they are doing is working fairly well and therefore does not warrant any change and a sense of general futility about the teaching profession and their ability to help the majority of their students learn (Moran, 1990). If we want schoolwide faculty to more responsibly and effectively educate their diverse and changing students, creating school norms of collegiality, experimentation, and support is essential.

Peer Coaching

School-based peer coaching is one proven way to improve faculty relations, encourage teachers to talk about teaching in a purposeful manner, and try new instructional practices. Peer coaching is a process in which colleagues voluntarily assist each other in developing their teaching repertoires through (a) reciprocal, focused, non-evaluative classroom observations and (b) prompt, constructive feedback on those observations.

But like many educational innovations, peer coaching is considerably more complex than it appears at first glance. Peer coaching can offer unparalleled support to teachers in their efforts to find new and better ways to educate their diverse students only if a program is supported by both teachers and administrators and carefully designed and implemented with an individual school's or department's culture and needs in mind. To implement a peer coaching program which indeed strengthens professional preparation and helps build a community of reflective educators, careful consideration must be given to the selection of the coaching model and coaching partners, the nature and extent of the training provided in coaching, and any logistical or financial constraints.

Coaching Models

Although various coaching models exist, the three most prevalent are technical coaching, collegial coaching, and challenge coaching. The *technical coaching* model stems from the work of Joyce and Showers (1982) and is used in conjunction with professional development to provide a structure

for the follow up that is essential for mastering complex teaching methods and curricular reforms. This model pairs teachers or teachers and consultants during the professional development session and provides training in using an assessment form designed to capture the key components of the new teaching method. The coaching partners use this form during classroom observations to record the presence or absence of specific behaviors and to later provide focused, nonevaluative feedback. Garmston (1987) highlights the multiple benefits of technical coaching when offered as a complement to quality staff development: enhanced collegiality, increased professional dialogue, creation of a shared pedagogical vocabulary, and maximum transfer of training.

Collegial coaching, most often conducted by pairs of teachers, concentrates on areas the observed teacher wishes to improve. This coaching approach leads colleagues to reflect together on personally relevant issues of teaching and learning. It encourages teachers to develop a habit of self-initiated reflection about their professional practice. The observed teacher's priority, rather than an instructional approach introduced in a staff development session, therefore determines the coaching focus. For example, a teacher may question the equity of student participation in class discussions and activities. Together, the coaching partners would then identify performance indicators for this instructional goal. The coach routinely gathers relevant data during classroom observations, then helps the observed teacher analyze and interpret it. This kind of coaching may be particularly helpful when a teacher wants assistance in getting an objective reading on the classroom dynamics, interaction, or atmosphere. The major goals of collegial coaching thus are to deepen collegiality, increase pedagogical dialogue, and facilitate professional instrospection rather than to assist a colleague in mastering specific new instructional practices.

Challenge coaching differs from technical and collegial coaching in both its process and projected outcomes. This coaching format enables teams of educational staff to conduct action research by coming up with creative responses to persistent problems they are experiencing in their daily practice. The term *challenge* refers to resolving a problematic instructional situation. Challenge coaching is conducted in small groups called *challenge teams* rather than pairs. These teams are commonly comprised of fellow teachers; however, unlike technical or collegial coaching practices, administrators and key support staff such as instructional aides and counselors may also be included because of their special perceptions or expertise. The result of challenge coaching is ideally a set of fresh perspectives and alternative strategies to use in the classroom and insightful, supportive feedback as an individual instructor strives to achieve a personal goal. Since collegiality,

trust, and protocol in problem solving through professional dialogue are essential conditions for challenge coaching, this model most successfully evolves after other coaching programs have already been successfully established.

An initial coaching program borrowing from both the technical and collegial coaching models promotes maximum transfer of training while creating a more collegial school environment which promotes professional dialogue and problem solving. Teachers first receive comprehensive training in instructional strategies in tandem with constructive coaching strategies. They are then encouraged to select a colleague as a coaching partner to mutually observe class sessions and collect objective data on specific teaching behaviors, utilizing a practical feedback form but focusing on the partner's preestablished instructional priorities.

Coaching Versus Evaluation

To wholeheartedly embark upon a peer coaching endeavor, most faculty members need to be solidly assured of the trustworthiness and confidentiality of the process. The goals and guidelines for peer coaching must therefore be clearly distinguished from professional evaluation. Traditional teacher evaluation typically implies summative judgment by an administrator or superior about an individual's total professional performance, whereas coaching implies formative assistance by a colleague/peer in a professional development process. It is thus critical that a coach not fall into the role of an evaluator during a coaching session even though it is a challenge for most to refrain from offering occasional unsolicited criticism and advice. Successful coaching programs can only be established in an atmosphere of mutual trust and support where teachers feel it is safe to experiment, fail, reflect, question, solicit help, revise, and try again. Nothing could be farther from this atmosphere than is the practice of traditional teacher evaluation, particularly when a performance evaluation is combined with an assessment for retention, tenure, or promotion. It is not surprising that teachers appear more concerned about negative evaluations for career advancement than in availing themselves of opportunities for professional growth (Corcoran, Walker, & White, 1988; Rosenholtz, 1985). Because an administrator frequently plays a relatively threatening evaluative role with teachers, peer coaching provides an alternative means for instructional support and goal setting in a school. While administrators may reasonably and sensitively help a teacher establish goals for improvement, in true peer coaching programs the process of refining curriculum and instructional delivery is primarily left to teachers working with fellow classroom practitioners.

The Coaching Process

Typically, the peer coaching process involves a preobservation conference and establishment of observation criteria, classroom observation, collection of data, a postconference, and establishment of subsequent observation criteria.

Preobservation conference

During the preobservation conference, the teacher makes explicit for the observer: (a) relevant background information about the class; (b) the intended purpose of the lesson; (c) expected student outcomes and behaviors; (d) planned teaching behaviors and strategies; (e) any special concerns about the lesson; (f) the desired focus of the observation; and (g) logistical arrangements for the observation. It is useful for each coaching partner to complete a preobservation form during this conference to record any pertinent information for the mutual upcoming classroom visits (see Appendix A).

The most difficult aspect of this step in the coaching process is identifying goals and concrete criteria for measuring those goals. Teachers must decide what is really important in their professional development and then try to operationalize those goals. It isn't manageable or fair for a coach to have a partner evade this crucial goal formulation and simply state: "Just come to my class and give me feedback on whatever you observe." The end result is generally counterproductive. The observed teacher may end up with an overwhelming amount of comprehensive feedback which smacks of evaluation, or very general, impractical comments which fail to engender enthusiasm for the program or faith in the partner.

Some teachers find their observations and conferences to be more focused and beneficial if they share common criteria than if they examine completely different aspects of teaching. Many novice coaches find it particularly useful at this stage to have a summary sheet of observable behaviors for specific instructional approaches. When coaching is intended to promote transfer of training, an observation form which recaps major tenets of a staff development session is generally appreciated by faculty (see Appendix B). Another suggestion is that partners select no more than five observation criteria per session. Otherwise, just as when a partner fails to establish observation criteria, the observations lack focus and the follow-up conferences lack substantive data.

Classroom observation

During the actual classroom observation, the peer coach records descriptive data but does not interpret or evaluate concrete classroom action, and instead focuses exclusively on the instructional elements previ-

ously identified by the teacher partner. Multiple data-gathering procedures exist, including record keeping on an observation instrument, audiotaping, and videotaping. Educational researchers have generated a variety of observation instruments which can facilitate data collection during classroom observations, depending on the nature of the instructional behaviors and goals specified by the teacher partner. Good and Brophy's (1984) *Looking In Classrooms* is a particularly good source of observation instruments. However, when coaching is encouraged to accomplish transfer of training, the most logical and manageable instrument is one which outlines the target improvements in instructional design and delivery. This focused observation form can be distributed and discussed during the actual training session and serves as a summary of the major tenets of the new instructional approach. Taking descriptive notes on the observation instrument helps improve the quality and extent of information a partner can share after a visit. However, for some teachers, a classroom observer absorbed in taking copious notes can be distracting to the point of being counterproductive. In such cases, teachers should stipulate during the preobservation conference whether they would be comfortable with a colleague observer taking notes. If not, the coach should be sure to budget 10 to 15 minutes immediately following the classroom visit to complete the observation form and note specific examples and comments. Moreover, to relieve any residual apprehension about peer observations being used for performance reviews, any and all data gathered during the course of the coaching sessions becomes exclusively the property of the observed teacher.

Postconference

During the postconference, the two colleagues discuss what actually happened during the lesson as opposed to what may have been planned. Rather than making recommendations, the observer facilitates this process by asking non-threatening questions. Questions such as "Is that what you expected to happen?" or "How would you do that differently?" prompt the teacher to reflect on the lesson, recalling actual teacher and student behaviors. When offering this feedback, the observer comments on elements of the lesson other than those established in the preobservation conference only if the colleague solicits additional information. In summary, peer coaches provide specific, solicited, limited, constructive feedback on what they see rather than what they feel. To close this session, the observed teacher decides upon the focus for the next observation, directly stating the aspects of curriculum or instructional delivery which should serve as follow-up observation priorities. The coach can facilitate this step by making sure that the items of focus are specific, manageable, and actually observable.

Selecting Coaching Partners

Coaches who are experts on enabling instructional practices in a multicultural classroom, such as bilingual or ESL resource teachers and teacher educators, can indeed provide invaluable professional input on curriculum and instruction if teachers perceive them as trustworthy, skilled colleagues and are willing to solicit their help. However, expecting resource teachers, project directors, or department chairs to provide the bulk of technical assistance following staff development is neither efficient nor realistic. Even exceptionally conscientious resource teachers and administrators, with superb interpersonal staff relations, can only provide ongoing assistance to a fraction of their teachers.

It is also worth noting that most faculty are strongly opposed to attending an inservice or being observed and coached by someone who is not currently teaching in a context similar to their own and experiencing what they view as the realities of the classroom. Furthermore, teachers are apt to resent mandates for schoolwide or departmentwide coaching rather than voluntary participation. Faculty are also likely to react negatively to administrative appointment of coaching partners rather than self-selection.

On a practical basis, most coaching should be performed by teams of classroom teachers working together to broaden their teaching repertoires. They are logistically and psychologically closer together, and if provided with effective, incremental training in new instructional practices as well as in coaching techniques, they are in an ideal positition to carry out all coaching functions. Further, if the major responsibility for coaching is placed with peers, status and power differentials are minimized and a more open, trusting, and collaborative atmosphere is created.

To help ensure faculty buy in and reduce anxiety, teachers should definitely be allowed to select their regular coaching partners or to form teams of four to eight colleagues who rotate observing each other. Teacher partnerships may be based on similarity in teaching context or partners may vary considerably in experience, content area, and level. The main ingredients for successful coaching relationships are mutual trust and respect. Nonetheless, there is at least one decided advantage to heterogeneous, interdisciplinary grouping. As members of instructional support teams structured across departments, courses, or grade levels, colleagues become more aware of their common resources and challenges. They also tend to focus their observations and ensuing discussions on target instructional practices and broader educational issues rather than primarily on curriculum.

Training of Coaches

Training in coaching is an essential condition for peer coaching to succeed and not be counterproductive. Although on the surface it appears that observing another teacher conduct a class is a relatively simple, straightforward process, teachers who participate in coaching programs are generally astonished by how challenging it is to be truly objective and faithful to a partner's requested observation criteria when recording data and conferencing. An effective training-for-coaching program trains teachers before they coach and includes follow-up training while the coaching program is under way. If, as Crandall (1983) and Guskey (1986) claim, teacher commitment follows practice rather than preceding it, then follow-up sessions in which all participating teachers can openly discuss their coaching experiences and refine their understandings and skills are even more crucial than initial formal training activities.

Training in coaching must empower teachers by helping them identify practices that impede movement toward collegiality and by equipping them with an extended repertoire of coaching skills. Among these skills, training in factual data gathering is fundamental, yet providing prompt, descriptive, nonevaluative feedback is perhaps the most crucial. A peer coach must have initially collected adequate relevant data on the colleague's preestablished target strategies and behaviors during the classroom observation. The coaching partner must then be ready to praise the observed colleague's efforts step by step while giving specific nonthreatening feedback which is grounded in the observation data. A supportive coach must also know how to ask nonjudgemental questions that help the partner to analyze and evaluate instructional decisions and that prompt reflection and improvement in teaching performance.

If logistics and trust factors favor peers as coaches, it follows that the training of coaches most sensibly takes place during the training of the teaching behaviors and strategies that require coaching. The goals of staff development should provide the broader structure for follow up observations. It is particularly helpful for beginning coaches to establish a narrow observational focus for gathering and reporting data. Some coaching partners experience unexpected difficulty identifying observable instructional goals and performance indicators and find their observations and conferences to be more beneficial if they share common criteria. Again, coaching program administrators can facilitate the process of establishing reasonable observation criteria by ensuring that faculty receive a feedback form which synthesizes target skills and behaviors from the staff development session. With such a form teachers will have not only a common vocabulary for discussing teaching and learning processes but a framework for selecting

instructional goals that are personally significant yet familiar to both members of the coaching partnership.

For example, the observation form in Appendix B was used to summarize the major tenets of a training session focusing on effective small-group work design and implementation in multicultural/multilingual high school and college classes (Kinsella & Sherak, 1993). For that session faculty selected no more than five initial instructional goals to serve as observation criteria for their peer coach. After receiving constructive feedback from their partner on these specific aspects of their classroom small-group work, each teacher then established a new set of criteria for the subsequent observation.

During the coaching training session, teachers greatly benefit from practice in conferencing skills and giving focused constructive feedback using a manageable observation form and watching classroom footage of instructors experimenting with the target instructional goals. The coaching trainer can establish clear observation criteria before teachers view each lesson segment, then facilitate roleplays in which participants provide facilitative feedback to the observed teacher. This crucial observation practice helps minimize any residual reticence about being evaluated rather than assisted by a peer coach.

Another way to help a school community develop a shared professional language and norms of experimentation is to structure regular coaching meetings. Monthly sharing sessions offer coaching teams comprised of faculty from different content areas and grade levels a chance to celebrate and demonstrate their successes, share perspectives, seek solutions to common problems, and gain new motivation to persist and refine skills.

Administrative Support for Peer Coaching

Any effective coaching program requires an active instructional leader. The cellular organization and the prevailing milieu of many schools makes coaching extremely difficult. A congenial, laissez-faire administrator does little to inspire faculty buy in, remove obstacles, foster collaboration, or eliminate teacher isolation.

Truly supportive principals, project directors, and department chairs provide both verbal and tangible support for a coaching program. Initially, they help faculty identify an appropriate coaching model, taking into careful consideration the school or department's culture, history of past change efforts, interstaff trust levels, and the size of the staff. They then lend direction and validation to a program by actually attending all staff development sessions and coaching training sessions, modeling positive coaching behaviors, and responding to coaches' concerns and constraints. Empathic

administrators know how important it is for teachers to work in a climate that supports collegiality and continuous growth. They reflect on their own collegial experiences and recognize how difficult it may be for many teachers to expose themselves to even a peer observer when they have been assigned to classes and largely left to fend for themselves for years.

Active instructional leaders and colleagues, therefore, support coaching efforts as a constructive formative alternative to merely summative evaluation. These administrators further demonstrate their recognition of the value of peer coaching by freeing up time and money to help a program flourish. They offer to take over classes, secure roving substitutes for the program on given days so that teachers can observe each other, and devote faculty meeting time for coaching teams to regroup for collegial sharing. Furthermore, they provide incentives to motivate reticent faculty, who may most benefit from participation, such as small stipends, release time, professional credits, and letters of commendation for personnel files. Finally, they regularly applaud the efforts of coaching teams in departmental and schoolwide staff meetings, personal memos, and campus newsletters.

The Role of Schools of Education

Norms of collegiality and experimentation have been shown to be necessary ingredients for the most effective teacher training (Little, 1982). Collegiality among faculty members means more than friendliness; it entails mutual respect and assistance and connecting on a professional level with a diverse staff. Further, while credential courses may be starting points for theoretical foundations and methodology, they do not begin to cover the wide range of classroom situations and student responses a new teacher is apt to encounter. Teachers in training need to be comfortable fluctuating between the comfortable and the unfamiliar, sharing successes, and openly seeking support in disappointments. This ability to take the risks necessary to teach more effectively and to constantly adjust goals and strategies necessitates a trusting, collaborative environment.

Schools of education can play key roles in preparing teachers who are advocates of reflective practice and collegiality. In their training programs, teacher interns can be shown how to effectively observe and coach each other. Instructional support teams can easily be formed within credential courses to provide mutual support for microteaching endeavors. These same team members can later take turns coaching each other during actual student teaching, as long as master teachers also advocate peer coaching and welcome scheduled visitors. In this way, developing education professionals can receive more extensive and varied feedback on their classroom practice along with more encouragement to persist and refine skills. Moreover, these

coaching opportunities will hopefully instill in new teachers a value for reflection, collaboration, and experimentation which they can carry along with their credentials into the workplace.

Developing Communities of Teacher-Scholars

Peer coaching is certainly one of the most promising avenues for teacher growth, rejuvenation, and empowerment. Used to complement culturally responsive teacher education, a coaching program equips school staff with skills in collaborative reflective practice as well as a structure for supporting ongoing curricular and instructional experimentation. Of perhaps greater importance, coaching strengthens collegial relationships. Whether with a partner or with a team, coaching affords teachers a safe, structured opportunity to raise questions and admit challenges. In this climate of safety and trust, an individual teacher is encouraged to actively seek suggestions from fellow classroom practitioners while undertaking an instructional leadership and guidance role traditionally reserved for administrators. Within such a community of faculty-scholars who continuously engage in the study of their craft, teachers are more likely to find the strength and support to become agents of change who strive to create more democratic schooling environments and who assume responsibility for contributing to the knowledge base of their profession. ■

References

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. (1978). Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Vol. VIII: *Implementing and Sustaining Innovations*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Corcoran, T. B., Walker, L. J., & White, J. L. (1988). *Working in urban schools*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Crandall, D. P. (1983). The teacher's role in school improvement. *Educational Leadership, 41*(3), 6-9.

Doyle, W., & Ponder, G. (1977). The practical ethic and teacher decision-making. *Interchange, 8*(3), 1-12.

Garmston, R. J. (1987). How administrators support peer coaching. *Educational Leadership, 44*(5), 18-27.

Goldenberg, C., & Gallimore, R. (1991). Changing teaching takes more than a one shot workshop. *Educational Leadership, 49*(3), 69-72.

Good, T., & Brophy, J. D. (1984). *Looking in classrooms*. Cambridge, MA.: Harper & Row.

Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. *Educational Researcher, 15*(5), 5-12.

Holly, F. (1982). Teachers' views on inservice training. *Phi Delta Kappan, 63*(b), 417-418.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. *Educational Leadership, 40*(1), 4-10.

Kinsella, K., & Sherak, K. (1993, March). *Making group work really work: More than meets the eye.* Paper presented at the meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Atlanta, GA.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Education Research Journal, 19*(3), 325-340.

Moran, S. W. (1990). Schools and the beginning teacher. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*(3), 210-13.

Rosenholz, S. J. (1985). Political myths about educational reform: Lessons from research on teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan, 66*(5), 349-55.

Shalaway, L. (1985, September). Peer coaching ... Does it work? *R & D Notes*, pp. 6-7.

Showers, B., Joyce, B., & Bennett, B. (1987). Synthesis of research on staff development: A framework for future study and a state-of-the-art analysis. *Educational Leadership, 45*, 77-87.

Appendix A

Preobservation Conference Form

Teacher _____ Peer Coach _____

1. **Observation Logistics**
   a. date _____
   b. classroom _____
   c. beginning time _____ ending time _____
   d. relationship of observer to students:
      detached _____ involved _____
   e. seating arrangement for observer:
      anywhere _____ assigned _____

2. **Class Background**
   a. subject area _____
   b. grade level _____
   c. number of students _____
   d. class make-up _____

3. **Lesson Description**
   a. learning objectives of the lesson:
   b. planned teaching behaviors and strategies:
   c. any concerns about the lesson:

4. **Specific Areas for Observation**
   a.
   b.
   c.
   d.

5. **Postobservation Conference**
   a. place _____
   b. date _____ c. time _____

Appendix B

Peer-Coaching Observation Form: Groupwork Design and Implementation

Instructor _____ Class _____ Date _____

Peer Coach _____

Directions: Provide feedback for your colleague on the aspects of effective classroom groupwork implementation which she or he has asked you to focus on during this observation. Write specific examples, comments, or questions which you want to be sure to discuss in your postobservation meetings.

___ 1. Prepared students with vocabulary and language strategies necessary for the group activity.

___ 2. Selected an activity which clearly lent itself to task-based, active collaboration.

___ 3. Related the activity to previous lessons and previous activities.

___ 4. Made explicit the purpose, procedures, and expected outcome of the group activity.

___ 5. Broke a more complicated task into manageable, clearly delineated steps.

___ 6. Gave clear oral instructions for the activity, accompanied by a visual aid; wrote the goals, time frame, and procedures on a handout, an overhead transparency, or the chalkboard.

___ 7. Modeled the task or a part of the task and checked to see if all students understood the instructions before placing them in groups.

___ 8. Established a clear and adequate time frame for students to complete all parts of the task.

___ 9. Explained the group member roles with behaviors necessary for completion of the task.

___ 10. Appeared to have a clear rationale for small-group formations.

___ 11. Encouraged cooperation, mutual support, and development of group accomplishment.

___ 12. Took an active, facilitative role while the small groups were in progress by providing feedback and guidance and getting students back on track.

___ 13. Saved adequate time to process the completed small-group activity as a unified class, clarifying what was learned and validating what was accomplished.

___ 14. Incorporated listening and responding tasks for students to complete during group reports to facilitate task processing and ensure active listening and accountability.

___ 15. Provided feedback to students on their prosocial skills and academic accomplishments during and/or after completion of the small-group activity.

___ 16. Asked students to evaluate their individual and/or small-group's performance by means of a form, quickwrite, or journal entry.

___ 17. Made sure that students saw the connection between what was generated, practiced, or accomplished during the small-group activity and any follow-up individual assignment.

Additional Notes and Comments:

Instructional Goals for Future Observations:

1.

2.

3.

4.

Kate Kinsella and Kathy Sherak, 1993

The CATESOL Journal

PETER ROOS
Multicultural Education, Training, and Advocacy

An Overview of The Rights of Immigrant Parents

The rights of immigrant parents and students have not been handed to them on a silver platter, nor is one to assume that the existence of protections implies wholesale embrace or acquiescence by school districts. Whether because of racism, anti-immigrant attitudes, or plain lack of imagination, most of the rights described in this article have come about only as a result of civil rights litigation and political advocacy by representatives of minority groups. Unfortunately, litigation and advocacy will likely continue to be necessary in many jurisdictions to insure that the rights are honored. However, the information provided here may inspire voluntary change in districts and schools that violate these rights out of ignorance rather than malice.

In thinking about the rights of immigrant parents it is crucial to remember one axiom: Immigrant parents have all of the rights of every other parent. The guiding principle that should thus govern a school district's response to these parents and their children is one of equality. If a school district through design, practice, policy, or even inadvertence has placed barriers in the way of full and meaningful access of immigrant parents or their children to educational opportunity, there is a significant possibility that legal rights are being violated.

Legislatures and courts have created some specific rules which respond to common barriers to equal access. In the following pages we will explore some of these. It is important to understand two things about the rights discussed herein. First, the reason that they exist is a recognition that affirmative steps are oftentimes necessary to secure equal access for those who come to our schools with needs which are different from English-speaking long-term residents of this country; secondly, these rights are in an evolving state. As advocates, legislatures, and courts develop a fuller recognition of the barriers that confront immigrant parents and their children, new rights and new remedies are likely. CATESOL members can assist in this process

of refining the knowledge base about practices that inhibit full access and help in the creation or expansion of the rights of newcomers who have so much to offer if given a fair chance.

The Right to Enroll a Child in School

The most basic right that a parent has is for his or her child to attend school. Immigrant parents often confront barriers that unlawfully inhibit this right which is taken for granted by others. It is unlawful to demand that a parent present evidence of lawful status in the country, a social security card, or a birth certificate as a precondition to admission to the elementary and secondary schools of the state. A school has no business asking about undocumented status. If social security numbers are used as a student ID or a birth certificate is used as a way to establish age for placement, alternative systems must be adopted for a parent who cannot produce these documents. The right to enroll in school also extends to children who reside with someone other than a parent for reasons beyond merely attending a certain school district. These children must be admitted even though their protectors do not have formal legal guardianship.

Right to Demand Equal Access to the Curriculum

Under both state and federal law, all students are entitled to equal access to the full curriculum offered by a school. The major barriers confronting immigrant students are those posed by limited English proficiency. Federal law recognizes that a student classified as limited English proficient (LEP) has two needs that must be addressed by a school district: (a) the need to learn English so that within a reasonable time students can be competitive with their English-speaking peers, and (b) the need for access to the curriculum. A district must address each of these needs in a pedagogically sound manner, using adequate resources (trained teachers, materials, etc.) to accomplish the goals of equal participation and must regularly assess the program to determine if students are achieving parity; if not, the program must be adjusted to give a reasonable opportunity for its accomplishment.

Despite the fact that Governor Deukmeijian vetoed the reauthorization of the state bilingual law in 1987, school districts which continue to receive state bilingual education funds must meet the general intended purposes of the vetoed act. These have been construed by the state Department of Education in ways that often give greater rights under state law than the more general federal provisions. For example, state law requires a native language (bilingual) program for students who cannot otherwise have access to the curriculum, unless the numbers are so small that it is impossible to do so. A plan to remedy the shortage of bilingual teachers must ordinarily be developed where there are not enough certified bilingual teachers.

Equal access to the curriculum certainly means that LEP pupils be able to participate in the entire curriculum. Thus at the secondary level, steps must be taken to insure that LEP pupils can participate meaningfully in the full range of offerings – not just the remedial track but also the advanced track. Where choice programs or magnets are offered in a district, meaningful access to these programs must be provided. A system that fails to provide opportunities to participate in gifted and talented programs is legally flawed as is one that does not accommodate those with special needs. Denial of access to Chapter One is a common barrier that is unlawful.

Specific Parental Rights to Access the Schools

All of the rights of students discussed here entitle parents to go to court or other forums to enforce their rights. Over and above those rights, which come to them as protectors of their children, are certain statutory rights given to assist parents to participate effectively in the schooling of their children and the governance of their schools.

In California, a school district with 50 or more LEP pupils or a school with 20 or more must have a parental advisory committee. While these committees are viewed as advisory, they also were the product of legislation that saw active and informed parental involvement as central to the development of responsive programs. Thus the law envisions that the membership is to be a majority of parents chosen by parents and that they will have access to documents and information so that they can intelligently contribute to the development and oversight of the LEP programs.

The federal migrant education program similarly envisions a parental advisory committee composed of a majority of parents, chosen by parents, with a right to access information needed to fully participate in the development and oversight of the program. There is furthermore a statewide parent advocacy group designed to influence state policy.

Linguistic accessibility is an important determinant of whether one can participate in governance activities such as advisory committees and in the education of one's child. The law requires that parental advisory committees be linguistically accessible to non-English speaking parents. This is specific with respect to the two committees discussed above and fairly implied with respect to other committees.

Both federal and state laws require that important notices be sent to parents in a language they can understand unless not practicable. While there are some debates over the threshold number of LEP parents that triggers such notices, at a minimum a school or district with a 15% LEP membership of a single language group must prepare such notices. Bilingual information should include report cards, test information, parental activity information, required discipline notices, and other forms or specific notices

that call for decision making by parents.

Like all other parents, an immigrant parent has the right to visit a child's school and classroom, subject, of course, to reasonable regulation.

Right to Respond to Low Achievement

Rights of parents to influence the education of their children through legal remedies have typically focused on inputs; thus the discussion above focuses primarily on inequalities in the delivery of services rather than on equality or adequacy of output or achievement.

There is increasing discussion in legal circles about rights of parents to secure a legal response to failure of their children. Due to the nascent state of this discussion and the lack of space, no more will be said.

However, two recent bills signed into law deserve some mention. Under these laws parents who are dissatisfied with their schools have rights to transfer under certain circumstances. These rights belong to immigrant parents like all others. This might be an alternative response to the enforcement of the equality principle set forth above.

Right to Adult Education

While this article has focused on the rights of parents to secure equitable educational programming for their children, one should not overlook the very real rights that these parents have to better themselves, and, thus indirectly, the life chances of their children. Federally funded adult education programs require consideration of the needs of non-English proficient immigrants in their programming; this is in addition to requirements in civil rights laws that these programs be accessible to these persons. While it is not uncommon to find ESL programs in adult education (though usually far fewer slots than are needed), it is not common to find adequate access to substantive offerings. This can constitute a legal wrong.

Conclusion

As stated at the outset, it is hoped that a school district, principal, or teacher armed with the information in this article will move to assure that the rights of immigrants are honored. Indeed it is important to remember that the law generally sets minimums. Nothing prevents, and often logic suggests, expansion of the rights mentioned here. In any event, if rights are not honored, political and possibly legal action is the appropriate response of parents. ■

The CATESOL Journal

KATHARINE DAVIES SAMWAY
San José State University

Putting Grading Into Context: From a Nightmare to a Learning Experience

As a teacher, I try hard to ensure that students have opportunities to be thoughtful, informed, and self-directed learners. This is true whether I am teaching elementary-aged children or graduate students. I now spend most of my time teaching prospective and practicing teachers and, although we meet only infrequently, I am determined to put into practice learning and teaching principles that guide me as a teacher of all learners. They include the following:

1. Learning is socially constructed, so it is essential that the classroom environment foster learning in and with both students and teachers;

2. The primary role of a teacher is to guide and challenge students, not to transmit information; and

3. Assessment procedures should inform the teacher about students' accomplishments as well as needs and encourage student self-reflection.

For the most part, I am successful in implementing the first two principles, even though students are usually not accustomed to being invited to take a more active role in their learning. What has been most difficult for me at the university level, however, has been to institute an assessment system that is consistent with my teaching goals and principles. As a teacher, I am most interested in using assessment to inform myself about individual students' growth, interests, and needs so that I can make appropriate instructional decisions. Student self-assessment has a key role to play in this endeavor. However, in higher education the most common form of assessment – grading – is seldom used to inform teachers and learners. Instead, grading simply judges students' worth. Some teachers claim that through grading we are able to "maintain standards" and ensure that students will work, the assumption being that without this type of extrinsic motivation students will not work.

Perhaps this is true in some teachers' classrooms. But while I have taught in situations in which students were allocated credit/no credit grades

and in situations in which letter grades were allocated, I have not found that the presence of grades has had this effect of keeping students on task. Instead, I have found that the allocation of a grade can transform engaged, responsible learners into dependent students who seem to be more concerned about the grade they will receive than with the quality of their work. This can be a very distressing transformation to witness and be a part of.

About two years ago, concerned about the negative impact of grading on students, I decided that I would try to eradicate the nightmare that was building around me and petitioned to teach credit/no credit courses. After my requests were denied, I realized that I needed to explore ways of better integrating university requirements with my own teaching principles and priorities. I began to explore alternative ways of arriving at grades, ways that would recognize the effort and achievement of students, and encourage students to view assessment as a means to learn about one's learning and learning processes.

One of the first changes that I instituted was to collaborate with students on grades. At mid-semester and end-of-semester conferences we now discuss their progress and grades. In preparation for these conferences, students hand in a written self-assessment in which they discuss their progress in each component that constitutes the final grade (e.g., participation, self-chosen reading and writing goals, and special project). I also refer to anecdotal records that I keep (e.g., observational notes, dialogue journal entries, records of short-term assignments). In most cases, students and I agree on the grades that they receive. On occasion, I believe that students are earning a higher grade than they credit themselves with. In other, usually more difficult, cases, I believe a student is not earning the grade that s/he suggests. In all cases, both the student and I explain our reasons for generating the grades we do. I listen carefully, look at the evidence, and make the final decision. At one point, I discovered that I was referring to this collaborative venture as a *negotiation*. This seemed to be more problematic than when I used the term *arrive at collaboratively*. Overall, this process has proven to be a less stressful and more meaningful way of addressing grading. Because we begin with self-assessment, the process reinforces students' investment in their own learning.

In a preservice reading/language arts course that I teach, I ask my graduate students to focus on developing their own literacy. I ask students to set reading and writing goals for themselves because I believe that, in order to be an effective teacher of reading and writing, one must be actively engaged in reading and writing. Two years ago, I did not ask students to grade their reading and writing because I thought that to do so would involve assessing the quality of their reading and writing and was afraid

that doing so would undermine their development as readers and writers. However, students were adamant about the need to include this important aspect of the course into the grading system.

Eventually, I realized that the grade could be arrived at by looking at the degree of challenge inherent in the goals, and how successfully students have met their goals. I ask students to set six-week long goals that they are interested in working on and which will challenge them. I then meet with each student in a brief, beginning-of-semester conference during which we discuss the goals, consider alternatives, make changes, and finalize them. The goals are highly idiosyncratic and have included, for example, making time each day to write, reading and writing poetry, writing a children's picture book, completing and sending off a short story to a publisher, and reading six pieces of extended nonfiction.

In preparing for the mid- and end-of-semester conferences, I ask students to comment on several features, including "What have been your major accomplishments?" and "What else would you like to have accomplished?" I have been struck over and over again by the magnitude of their accomplishments, the honesty of their responses, the ability they possess to express developing philosophies of how to teach language and literacy, and the degree to which focusing on developing their own literacy has altered their reading and writing habits (as well as how they view themselves as literate people). The following excerpt from Victoria's self-assessment illustrates these points:

> Reading, reading, reading. I've never before done so much reading in this span of time; in fact, I've never even come close. Although I didn't read a few of the articles in their entirety, and I didn't finish the Rigg/Allen book (I got sick when I was half way through and then many projects were pressing on me), I read ten professional journal articles (the last four are still pending), four and a half professional books, many books for young people ... I feel much more informed on books that I would want to include in my class library and also on reference books and articles to turn to for activities and guidance.
>
> I've also become much more comfortable with writing, and have even developed a desire to share some of my writings. This is a big step for me. Before I only asked a friend to proof read a paper, and it was hard enough to ask that much. Now I have shared stories and poems that I have written because I think the reader might relate to them in some way. I've also become much more interested in others' writings. The most challenging writing process I undertook was trying to write

meaningful poems for my mother. I struggled a great deal with this, but the result of sharing these poems made the effort well worth it.

... The group Poetry Project was my biggest disappointment ... I think I had unrealistic expectations about how much time it would take to do this and how much we could accomplish during class workshop time. I've already told you that I didn't communicate as effectively as I would have liked on this project ... I also need to make greater efforts to stay in touch with and to be receptive to others' points of view in a group process. (Victoria, end-of-semester self-assessment)

When I read these comments from Victoria, I was struck by how much more I knew of her as a learner by reading them. I knew that Victoria had become a prolific reader, but I didn't know what and how much she read or the depth of its impact on her. I knew that she had been unsure about the wisdom of selecting the writing goal for herself of writing poems about and for her mother, a person with whom she had a difficult relationship, but I did not know whether she had met her goals and what the impact had been on her as a human being and writer. I also knew that working on her special project had not always been easy, but I wasn't sure what she had learned from the experience. The written self-assessment allowed me to gain insights into Victoria's learning processes, get answers to questions I had. It also offered me an opportunity to assess the degree to which Victoria had set challenging reading and writing goals and had met them. When we met for an end-of-semester conference, during which we collaboratively arrived at her grade for the course, I had read Victoria's self-assessment and was able to explore issues with her that seemed important, for example, why she was now more interested in reading other people's writing and how her special project group had resolved its differences.

Another student, Youngshin, decided to use her reading and writing goal setting to: (a) write about her experiences with racism as an immigrant in a U.S. elementary school, and (b) learn to read in her parents' native language. In preparation for the midsemester conference , she wrote:

I have been keeping up with my goals. I have been writing a collection of reflections and poems on my childhood and the racism I have encountered while growing up in the States. I've gone through a few drafts on some and conferred a couple of times on some as well. It was difficult getting it out and facing those locked up memories. The major difficulty I'm facing though is that I have never really written poems or long narra-

tives except for reports and journals and I am finding it difficult to get a final draft on any of my work.

My reading goal has done me a big favor. It has given me a new look into my culture. I try to read the Korean newspaper every other day. What I cannot read is the ancient Chinese-style writing the articles have ... It is exciting ... I'm learning to read all over again.

Youngshin is a fairly reticent member of the class and I was not quite sure how she was doing. Through this written self-assessment, I was able to understand her much better as a person and as a learner. In the conference, we talked about the influence of audience on one's writing. I asked Youngshin about the extent to which her goals had challenged her and she explained how difficult it was for her to read Korean and how her father had been helping her, including buying books in Korean. She also talked about the emotional difficulty of writing in a sustained way about an era in her life that had been so painful.

Through these self-assessments I have learned about the intellectual and practical accomplishments, stumbling blocks, and future goals of students. Self-assessment is not an easy proposition for many students. They are generally not accustomed to stepping back and consciously reflecting upon what they have done, what they have accomplished, and what they plan on doing in the future. Students are more accustomed to someone else placing value on their efforts and work, and, in some cases, they are reluctant to place their own grade on their work. I originally introduced the written self-assessments as a means for students to become more knowledgeable about their learning, an experience with meta-learning. I have since found it to be a very helpful and less stressful mechanism for arriving at grades. While I am perfectly capable of assessing who is doing A-work or B-work, if that is all that occurs, then assessment will not serve to help students become reflective learners who continually challenge themselves.

As in so many other aspects of my teaching, grading is in a state of flux. I search for a system that is entirely valid, supportive of learners, and manageable for me. Recently, I began to involve students in the development of grading criteria. This began to evolve last summer as I spent hours trying to figure out how to grade students in a language assessment course I was about to teach. I struggled for weeks to develop grading criteria that would be consistent with the goals of the course (e.g., read widely about second language acquisition/teaching and assessment ; develop alternative assessment procedures with students acquiring English and analyze the results; become an "expert" in an assessment-related topic and write a document that would be of interest and use to other teachers; and critique exist-

ing tests). It then occurred to me that I should turn over the development of this part of the course to the class—I argued to myself, "This is, after all, an assessment class, and in the United States grading is a key component of assessment." And that is exactly what I did.

I offered sample grading criteria for them to use as a point of departure. Students selected the component of the class that they wished to work on in a group (participation, evaluation of a standardized test for use with learners acquiring English, and an assessment-related special project). The groups drafted grading criteria, which they brought back to the class for discussion. I had been conducting beginning-of-semester conferences during the group discussions, but stayed in the classroom to listen to the whole class discussion so that I would be better able to understand the grading criteria that I would then be implementing collaboratively with each class member. The discussion was lively, led to important clarification of key elements (e.g., what a minimal level of involvement in the class would look like compared to a superior engagement in the class), generated a very valuable discussion of peer assessment versus self-assessment, and even initiated a new requirement for class members (each person would briefly assess in writing his/her preparation for and participation in class at the end of each meeting and set goals for him/herself for the next week). I listened carefully and spoke only when asked to clarify a point. I met the next day with representatives from each of the groups to finalize the grading criteria. The one issue that required a fair amount of discussion was the elimination of subcategories and sub-sub-subcategories of grade components, each with their own percentages. I explained that the system was far too convoluted, and I wasn't willing to spend so much time trying to calculate grades. This process of involving the whole class seemed to have a positive effect upon students' willingness to focus more on the content of the class than grades.

A grading-related issue that I am now exploring is the use of portfolio assessment in university graduate classes. I already ask students to put together a course portfolio in which they illustrate and reflect upon their learning during the semester. At the moment, this course portfolio is not designed or used as a formal assessment tool, except that it informs me about students' accomplishments and the development of their knowledge and what they think about this development. I would welcome any suggestions from readers who have had experience with this approach to assessment. ■

The CATESOL Journal

MARGUERITE ANN SNOW
California State University, Los Angeles

Collaboration Across Disciplines In Postsecondary Education: Attitudinal Challenges

To begin this discussion of collaboration across disciplines, I would like to present three common concerns about teaching in the multicultural university of the 90s which I frequently hear from content-area instructors:

- My classes are filled with students who don't speak the language, can't read the textbook, and can't write a decent paper. These kids have graduated from American high schools, but they're not ready for college.
- I'm an economics professor. You can't expect me to become an English teacher, and anyway, I don't have the time.
- I would really like to reach these students, but I don't have the background or training.

These comments reflect the attitudinal continuum among teachers I've met in working across the disciplines in the postsecondary setting. These teachers range from those who are having trouble accepting the reality that demographic changes in California have profoundly affected the type of student coming into our colleges and universities, to those so entrenched in their traditional roles that they resist changing their instructional strategies, to those concerned faculty members who recognize that accommodations are in order but who feel at a loss in terms of expertise and experience to make the accommodation.

As an increasing number of language minority students enroll in college and university classes, content-area faculty require assistance in dealing with the instructional demands of teaching second language students. While many are indeed skillful teachers, there is a growing mismatch between the teaching strategies they have honed over the years for one type

of population and approaches which will engage the linguistically and culturally diverse students presently enrolled in their classes. The pedagogy exists in TESOL to collaborate with our content colleagues, but an attitudinal backdrop must also be considered for meaningful, sustained change to occur. In keeping with the theme of this special issue, I'll address some of the challenges of interdisciplinary collaboration which typically fall outside of discussions of pedagogy per se. Specifically, I'll discuss attitudes that content-area faculty hold about students' educational backgrounds and language skills and strategies for countering some of the obstacles that prevent faculty involvement in interdisciplinary collaboration. This discussion is based on my experience at California State University, Los Angeles where I codirect Project LEAP: Learning English for Academic Purposes, a program funded by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) grant in which general education faculty, peer tutors, and language specialists work together to assist language minority students to improve their academic literacy skills.

Let me say at the outset that responsibility for meeting the needs of our language minority students is a two-way street. TESOL professionals in higher education must, in my opinion, take a broader view of their roles and responsibilities. We have much to offer our colleagues across the disciplines. The impact we can make in our individual ESL classes, while certainly significant and not to be underestimated, is limited when one considers the far greater amounts of time our students spend outside ESL courses in the real world of content-area classes. In addition to providing a critical outlet for our expertise, cross-curricular collaboration presents an opportunity for increased visibility and stature in the eyes of our campus communities as our content-area colleagues look to TESOL professionals for answers to their vexing questions about how to reach second language students.

In convincing our content-area colleagues to take greater responsibility for reaching all students, we need to begin by dealing head on with attitudes about who these students are and what kind of skills they bring to class. Content-area instructors must be sensitized to the complex social and demographic factors involved in educating language minority students in California's schools. From my experience, faculty simplify this complexity in two different ways. In one scenario, faculty make no distinction between the native English-speaking students taking their classes and their second language counterparts, and, thus, fail to understand the tremendous academic demands placed on language minority students in their classes. In this regard, I have found that Cummins' work provides insights that content-area faculty find very enlightening (see Cummins, 1981, 1992). In the other scenario, faculty refer generically to nonmainstream students as *for-*

eign students. While clearly there are many international students attending California colleges and universities, by far the majority of language minority students on our campuses are immigrants who have no plans to return to their home countries or U.S.-born students who have a second language in their personal or educational background.

The following characteristics of language and educational background may be helpful in distinguishing language minority students from each other and in assisting content-area faculty to understand their complex profile:

1. Some of the students we see in our college and university classes are recent immigrants who have developed social communicative skills in English through beginning-level ESL classes or through exposure to an English-speaking environment but have not yet developed academic language skills appropriate to their educational level;

2. Other language minority students have acquired academic language skills in their native language and initial proficiency in English but need assistance in transferring concepts and skills learned in the first language to English;

3. Still other students may have lived in this country for a long time or been born in the U.S. While usually bilingual, they are English-dominant as they have received little or no schooling in their first language. These students may have done quite well in their high school courses but are often not prepared for the increased demands of college or university study because they lack sufficient experience with or systematic instruction in academic language skills.

To deal with the attitudes exemplified in the faculty comments which appeared at the beginning of this article, TESOL professionals have to think realistically about what will motivate faculty to collaborate. In other words, how can we get faculty to buy in to cross-curricular collaboration? I believe that the answer requires several strategies. First, we must assist content-area instructors in improving their approach to teaching. Secondly, we must convince content-area faculty that they will see improvement in their students' mastery of course content if they assist them with academic language skills. Successful marketing of cross-curricular collaboration must also cast the ultimate objective of such activities as that of raising standards and course rigor rather than expecting less of students.

To meet the attitudinal challenges posed by interdisciplinary collaboration, we at Project LEAP look to Meyer (1993) who said, "Teachers should have two goals: to teach the content, and to teach the necessary conditions for learning it" (p. 106). We have seen dramatic changes in the attitudes of faculty after they have experienced a positive washback from being attentive to students' language needs and changing their own instructional strategies.

For example, faculty in Project LEAP general education courses have seen significant improvement in the quality of student writing and content understanding after redesigning their previous one-shot term paper assignments into multistep exercises whereby students submit assignments in stages. In an introduction to a political science course, Project LEAP students received very detailed guidelines at the beginning of the term, participated in a library tour, completed a homework assignment in which they learned to use on-line data sources such as LEXIS/NEXIS and CARL to conduct their research, reviewed model papers, and turned in the introduction and literature review sections of their research papers at the midterm point. They then added a discussion and conclusion, incorporating peer and instructor feedback in the production of the final draft.

Professors have also seen tremendous payoffs after experimenting with different ways to help students prepare for exams. In a humans-and-their-biological-environment course, for instance, the biology professor permitted students to submit questions to be used on examinations. By the third midterm exam, 42% of the questions which appeared on the exam were student generated. In cultural anthropology, a professor has seen an increase in the number of A and B grades awarded after asking students to bring mock essay questions to class and giving them time during class to brainstorm possible answers in groups.

In addition to revamping paper assignments and experimenting with student involvement in examinations, we have found content faculty receptive to a variety of other strategies for enhancing their own teaching approaches and so improving student mastery of course content. These include ways to:

(a) revise their course syllabi to make expectations clearer;

(b) accommodate diverse learning styles in the classroom through a variety of instructional techniques (e.g., increased wait time, avoiding spotlighting students, group work);

(c) craft writing assignments which make explicit the critical thinking or analytical requirements of the assignment;

(d) encourage more interaction between faculty and students (e.g., making one visit to the professor during office hours a course requirement);

(e) make students more accountable for keeping up with reading assignments (e.g., pop quizzes, study guides);

(f) assist students with note-taking strategies; and

(g) improve lecturing strategies such as:

- reviewing key concepts from the previous lecture,

- writing an agenda on the blackboard for each class session,
- not taking for granted that students possess general academic vocabulary (e.g., terms such as *hypothesis, watershed*),
- minimizing cultural, generational, or class-based references which might not be part of students' background experiences (e.g., *Alice in Wonderland, Gary Cooper, mortgage payment*).

Project LEAP faculty have also welcomed suggestions for responding to student writing and designing better multiple choice and short answer test items.[1]

Selecting faculty to participate in cross-curricular collaboration is tricky business. We have found that junior-level faculty who themselves were educated in a multicultural milieu may be more likely to embrace the notions of diversity and equity in education. On the other hand, nontenured faculty, in general, do not hold leadership positions within their departments and, thus, the multiplier effect may be harder to achieve when working with them than when aiming at the outset to convert senior faculty to cross-curricular collaboration. The two most critical characteristics in selecting faculty, in our experience, are flexibility and willingness to change – attributes which know no age or status limits.

Other attitudinal challenges exist. We have found that, while many faculty members are very committed to improving their instructional skills, they are also wary of being perceived in their departments as too involved in teaching concerns when it comes time for review for promotion. Or, when they have innovated and produced positive results (i.e., students performed better in their classes), they are criticized for giving too many high grades or it is assumed that they grade too leniently. We have to accept that these kinds of biases and misperceptions exist and be prepared to help content-area faculty prove to their colleagues that they have, in fact, raised course standards by giving more complex assignments and holding students accountable for demonstrating high levels of content knowledge and language skill.

In short, TESOL professionals should take the initiative to share what we know about teaching language minority students by offering workshops and training sessions or developing comprehensive cross-curricular programs. Several recent CATESOL presentations have reported on efforts at the community college level aimed at assisting content-area faculty to meet the needs of second language students at Contra Costa College (Fragiadakis & Smith, 1992) and Santa Monica and Rio Hondo Colleges (Hartnett & Chabran, 1993). Beyond the workshop level, a variety of models of interdisciplinary collaboration exists at the postsecondary level. To cite two, writing across the curriculum is well-documented in the composi-

tion community (see Fulwiler & Young, 1990) and the adjunct model in the ESL literature (see Benesch, 1988; Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989).

The stage is set for collaboration across the disciplines in California's multicultural colleges and universities. While there are many attitudinal challenges inherent in cross-curricular endeavors, we have much evidence that indicates that ESL and content-area faculty can successfully join forces to insure that language minority students develop the skills needed for academic success. ■

Footnotes

1. To receive Project LEAP training manuals containing instructional materials designed to assist language minority students in the development of their academic language skills, please write or call: Project LEAP, Learning Resources Center, Library South, Room 1040A, California State University, Los Angeles, 5151 State University Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90032, (213) 343-3970.

References

Benesch, S. (Ed.). (1988). *Ending remediation: Linking ESL and content in higher education.* Washington DC: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Brinton, D., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction.* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education, *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3-49). Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.

Cummins, J. (1992). Language proficiency, bilingualism, and academic achievement. In P. Richard-Amato & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *The multicultural classroom: Readings for content-area teachers* (pp. 16-26). New York: Longman.

Fragiadakis, H., & Smith, E. (1992, April). *Campus outreach: Training non-ESL instructors and staff.* Paper presented at the meeting of California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Sacramento, CA.

Fulwiler, T., & Young, A. (Eds.). (1990). *Programs that work: Models and methods for writing across the curriculum.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Hartnett, D., & Chabran, G. (1993, March). *Training content instructors to help community college ESL students.* Paper presented at the meeting of California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Monterey, CA.

Meyer, D. (1993). Recognizing and changing students'misperceptions: An instructional perspective. *College Teaching, 41*(3), 104-108.

The CATESOL Journal

LAUREN A. VANETT
San Francisco State University
College of Extended Learning
and LOIS FACER
Mission College

Influences From Beyond The Workplace ESL Classroom: The Relationship Between Traditional, Transitional, and High Performance Organizations and Workplace ESL Teachers

In California and the rest of the country, increased education, particularly in the area of basic skills, is a necessity for today's workforce. Jobs which once required only the use of a person's hands to complete routine tasks with assembly line efficiency are disappearing quickly. In the past, "the only prerequisites for most jobs were an ability to comprehend simple oral and written directives and sufficient self-control to implement them" (Reich, 1992, p. 59). The fluid demands of today's workplace require that individuals have the ability to communicate successfully. Employees must be able to interact with one another to convey basic information and use critical thinking skills in order to troubleshoot and problem solve together. Teamwork is valued, and members of teams, who come from all areas of the organization, must feel comfortable communicating within their group and being active contributors to the process.

Twenty years ago, immigrants wanting to enter the job market had access to vocational ESL and basic skills training in preemployment training programs, adult schools, and community colleges. These local, state, and federally funded programs suffered a severe blow during the 1980s. The need for this kind of education, however, did not diminish but, in fact, has grown in tandem with the continued influx of immigrants. Due to insufficient government funding and the lack of a cohesive national policy on workplace education, some businesses began to look for their own solutions to providing basic skills training for their immigrant employees (Chisman, 1992).

Businesses in the United States have traditionally offered in-house training programs and opportunities for continuing education, most often directed at managers rather than employees in nonmanagerial positions.

"Each year, American employers spend an estimated $30 billion on formal training. At most, however, only one third of this amount is spent on our noncollege educated workforce, affecting no more than 8% of our front-line workers" (National Center on Education & the Economy's Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce, 1990). Our experience shows that many on-site ESL programs, on the other hand, are directed toward these very employees who have not benefitted from workplace education in the past.

Today both the government and the business community recognize the need for increased attention to and funding for workplace education to keep the U.S. globally competitive. Over the last several years, driven by economic necessity and California's increasingly diverse demographics, proactive California businesses have begun initiating workplace education programs either on their own or in partnership with other organizations. Frequently, these programs have included an ESL component.

Sondra Stein (1991) and her colleague, Laura Sperazi, have developed a framework that describes two kinds of organizations: traditional and high performance. We see this framework as one means to inform the perspectives of current and future worksite ESL teachers and provide them with a tool to better understand the volatile nature of today's workplace.

Stein and Sperazi describe traditional and high performance work organizations in the manufacturing industry according to their views of the production process and work organization, the role of workplace education, and the development and implementation of workplace education programs. Though created with the manufacturing industry in mind, these categorizations, with some adjustment, can also be used to examine service-oriented organizations.

In summary, traditional organizations use a scientific management approach, in which complex jobs are broken into simple, rote tasks which workers can repeat with machine-like efficiency. Work is performed on production or assembly lines by individuals working alone on discrete tasks. Because cost is the driving factor, workers fear that improvements will lead to elimination of jobs.

The traditional company does not have a long-term strategy that integrates a comprehensive education and training program into the overall business plan. Often, training is task oriented and job specific. The presumed conflict between education and production is reflected in the fact that workers are not given release time for participation. If a workplace education program does exist on-site, neither workers, supervisors, nor unions are involved in the process of planning, implementing, and evaluating the program. Finally, the company makes no plans to institutionalize the program.

The Stein/Sperazi framework also describes high performance organizations. These organizations prefer a total quality approach to management in which a key goal is to involve every member of the workforce in the processes of improving quality, efficiency, and customer satisfaction. Work is done in self-managing groups, by individuals working in teams. Because incremental improvement is the driving factor, workers are rewarded for innovations.

Unlike traditional companies, high performance organizations view education and training as part of their long-term strategic plan for continuous improvement. No conflict is perceived between production and education, and education takes place on work time. Top management is invested in setting goals and outcomes for workplace education programs, and participatory planning, implementation and evaluation processes involve all stakeholders in the workplace education program. Companies plan to not only institutionalize programs but also integrate education into on-the-job practices (Stein & Sperazi, 1991).

In these changing times, most organizations fall somewhere in between the traditional and high performance categories, with some striving to become high performance organizations and others struggling to make the shift with great difficulty if not reluctance. Still other organizations find that traditional business practices work for them, and they continue to run their businesses in a way that has proved successful for years.

We believe Stein and Sperazi's (1991) characterizations of traditional and high performance organizations can provide ESL teachers with a framework in which to understand and discuss the influences that affect their workplace teaching. We also see this framework as a tool that can help ESL teachers adjust their curricula and expectations to a particular workplace situation.

Conversations With Workplace Teachers

We shared Stein and Sperazi's framework with seven workplace ESL educators. Because we wanted to learn from the experiences of a cross-section of teachers who had taught in workplaces, we first identified educators or organizations that we knew to have good reputations in this field. We then invited two independent contractors, one teacher employed by a community based organization, one employed by a community college, and three from a state university extended education program to participate in focus groups or individual interviews. During these meetings, we asked them to consider the various workplaces in which they had taught and then respond to a set of questions.

Of this group, four had MA degrees in TES/FL, and one had gone on to get a PhD in linguistics. The other three teachers had masters degrees in

related fields. The least experienced of the group had been involved in language teaching for five years while the most experienced had taught for 22 years. Among them, they had taught at 37 large, midsized, or small companies (three had experience within the same organization) over the last five years and had been teaching ESL in workplaces from 2 to 15 years.

We asked the teachers to view the Stein/Sperazi framework as if it represented two poles on a continuum. As workplace program administrators, while we have both been involved with companies that are on the way to becoming high performance organizations, we had yet to work with one that had truly achieved that goal. Thus, we modified the high performance category calling it *approaching high performance*. In addition we created a third category called *transitional* to represent those organizations with developing awareness about the need for change but limited or no resources to alter how work gets done at this time.

Our use of the terms traditional, transitional, and high performance should not be viewed as indicators of how successful a particular business may or may not be. While high performance organizations, by their nature, are far more conducive to workplace ESL programs, on-site teachers who recognize the confines and needs of traditional and transitional organizations have run successful courses in these contexts. As one informant told us:

> Regardless of whether a company is traditional or high performance, I always think of myself as a consultant to the company, asking the question, 'What do they need?' ... Companies don't always see themselves as moving toward high performance when they contact me to do this work, but when they make the connection, their eyes light up.

For the purpose of this paper, we will refer to 12 of the workplaces our informants discussed. The way they grouped these workplaces is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Workplace Groupings

Traditional	Transitional	Approaching High Performance
Hotel Group 1	Hotel Group 2	Hotel Group 3
Insurance Company 1	Government Agency 1	Insurance Company 2
High Tech Company	Government Agency 2	Bakery
Garment Manufacturer	Computer Manufacturer	Medical Equipment

Previous literature on workplace ESL (Alamprese, 1993; Andrews, 1990; Ford, 1992; Hayflich & Lomperis, 1992; Sarmiento, 1991; Spruck Wrigley, 1991) tells us that the following elements are key to successful on-site ESL programs: (a) company (and union where appropriate) buy in for the program; (b) use of a needs assessment; (c) customized and flexible curricula; (d) on-going program evaluation; (e) voluntary employee participation; and (f) instructor flexibility. These elements, when considered alone, exist as generic categories that mask how profoundly the workplace context (traditional, transitional, approaching high performance) can alter the experience of the teacher, the design of the course, and the development of the program.

By asking ESL providers to identify where their workplace clients fit into the traditional to high performance continuum, we were able to highlight common influences on the teachers' experiences that emerged from outside of their workplace classrooms. The characterizations of traditional and transitional organizations as well as those for organizations approaching high performance override many differences due to company size and the nature of the industry. Key points from our conversations with these teachers are summarized below.

Traditional Organizations

Attitudes toward workplace programs in the traditional organizations were varied. Insurance Company 1 took an exceedingly long time to decide to conduct an on-site ESL program and to select a provider. The company wanted the provider to conduct a 45-minute lunch hour [sic] customized course in oral communication skills. The provider indicated that this would not be adequate for teaching a pronunciation and conversation class, especially if employees were expected to eat during that time. When senior management refused to provide employees with an additional 45 minutes of company time for each class meeting, the provider and human resources representatives concurred that it would be inappropriate to run the course at all. By not having executive buy in for a sound educational program from the start, this company demonstrated its lack of readiness to engage in on-site ESL training.

As in the case of Insurance Company 1, lack of buy in at Hotel Group 1 was a problem. The teacher was expected to meet company goals without getting company support for the program. Because there were many levels of hierarchy and only one supervisor who championed the program, the instructor felt stymied at every step of the way. By only providing materials specific to the employees' current jobs and not geared toward enhancing their promotability, hotel management further demonstrated its traditional

view of workplace education. Because workers were not viewed as whole people and the emphasis was on cost cutting rather than true employee development, employees didn't always show up for class and often felt depressed, tired, and overworked when they did. In addition, the amount of time allocated for this program was limited.

Stein and Sperazi (1991) note that in a traditional organization, "management treats employees as 'hands.' The worker is not a whole person (check your brains at the door)." The relationship between employees and management at the garment manufacturer was challenged as employees in the ESL program began to understand more about their rights as workers. In fact, workers' rights was the intended topic for the sixth module of the training. In the instructor's opinion, management cancelled this module because they felt the curriculum to be too threatening. The instructor believed that management preferred to view their employees as "programmed little sewing machines" and not as confident, thinking adults.

At the High Tech Company, the instructor reported,

> I worked in fear because I didn't know if I was giving them what they wanted because they didn't know what they wanted. ... I was supposed to be able to read their minds and have all the answers. It took a long time to figure out needs because there was not only no support, but also no awareness. The attitude was, 'You're the teacher; you should know what to teach.'

Transitional Organizations

Many transitional organizations revealed an inconsistency between their philosophy and their actions. This was usually reflected throughout the organization and particularly in the inconsistent goals for and attitudes toward workplace ESL programs.

In the case of Hotel Group 2, management had begun to view itself as moving toward high performance. The intention to bring in an on-site ESL program was a reflection of this shift. This view, however, had not filtered through to the employees, who still saw management as traditional and, as a result, continued to view their own work in a job-specific, less team-oriented manner. Thus, management and employees had differing goals for the outcome of the program.

A similar discrepancy existed in Government Agencies (GA) 1 and 2. In both situations, employees viewed themselves and management as traditional in regard to their notions of ESL as a job training tool. Management in GA 1 knew they needed to change, but felt bound by the endless bureaucracy and preexisting hierarchy of the organization. In GA 2, a human resource representative was the beacon for change. Senior manage-

ment, however, was not tapped to participate in the on-site ESL program, and while employees and their supervisors all bought into the program, they had different expectations about what the outcomes might be.

In this situation, supervisors estimated their nonnative English-speaking employees to have far less skill using English than observed by the instructor. They also had very specific goals and expectations for their employees, among them to improve pronunciation and better manage telephone calls. The employees, on the other hand, felt demoralized by their own perceptions of how they used English and how coworkers and supervisors related to them.

The instructor often felt like a therapist, helping employees to overcome feelings of inferiority because they had received so much negative feedback from internal and external clients. So, while supervisors felt the problems grew out of specific language issues, the instructor saw the overriding issue to be one of confidence. At the end of the course, employees reported being more assertive and comfortable with their use of English, and many of their supervisors acknowledged progress had been made. As in many on-site classes, the first round of improvement grew out of an increase in confidence rather than a dramatic change in language use.

In one department of GA 1, where traditional forces were evident, the instructor felt the need to be very results-oriented, always having to validate her presence in the organization. In addition, she felt the need to constantly promote the program, "to explain the process, not the training" because ESL differs from other types of training with which the organization was more familiar.

At the Computer Manufacturer, the instructor summed up her feelings this way:

> Trust is not total. I had to perform a balancing act, working with a very controlling management at their level, while trying to be true to what is best for the students. You have to try to help management grow in how they view the class; play on their strong points; keep your boundaries clear, know your objectives and be able to clearly state them ... and, the teacher needs to work on not getting mad.

Approaching High Performance

The organizations in this category had gone through perceptual shifts about how to do business which were clear throughout all levels of their organizations. Employees understood that the company had a mission that involved their personal development as part of the organizational strategy for growth and change. The instructors who taught at these sites each

acknowledged that these organizations allowed them to focus on not only job-specific language, but also higher order thinking skills that ultimately would increase employees' potential for promotion and their ability to contribute more fully to the company.

Hotel Group 3, for example, moved toward a high performance model because they understood they needed to view training as an investment rather than as a cost. This perception grew out of their ability to view themselves as internationally competitive, competing for business with not only other hotels in the city but also other cities around the world. The instructor who worked with this hotel explained that management had a long range view of workplace education and was more interested in having ESL classes focus on the teaching of processes and procedures rather than simply job-specific, formulaic language.

One of the instructors for Insurance Company 2 reported how well informed employees and their supervisors were about the value of the ESL classes. Information about the ESL program had been integrated into the company's larger restructuring process; this created a real awareness of the company's commitment to long-term training and, as a result, fostered company support throughout all levels of the organization. Another instructor at this company noted that because the attitude of management toward the ESL program was such an open one, employees didn't view language issues as so closely connected to their self-esteem; she stated, "I felt freer to ask questions, to explore and try new things because the goals weren't so narrowly focused."

The Bakery's attitude toward the on-site program came from a different source – viewing themselves as "being on the cutting edge of social awareness." They wanted employees to be "better workers and people." Their company philosophy included seeing workers holistically, with training viewed as a return on investment and not a lost cost. The Medical Equipment Firm echoed these views as well, in particular, "seeing people as resources not liabilities." This attitude was reflected through support for the ESL program and within the organization as a whole.

The instructor who worked at the Medical Equipment Firm commented, "These companies are visionary. Dreamers work here. But how realistically can we ESL teachers affect or reach this vision through our work?" Then she raised a point that was validated by three of the other teachers, "[At high performance companies] they trust you too much, and this can be scary."

These companies gave instructors lots of access to the organization and its people as well as significant freedom in determining what was taught. As instructors worked toward developing more and more customized mate-

rials, shaping their classes to mirror employee and company goals, some voiced concern that as their programs became more established, management and supervisors became increasingly "hands off."

Said one instructor:

> Management has a certain passivity because they see teachers as experts; if we know what we're doing, they don't understand why we have to keep going back. They wonder, "Wasn't the needs assessment long enough?" My job is to go back and educate them, to make them realize their continuous involvement is needed [Without their regular input,] I find out half way through a module other things that could have been included. Their passivity results both from their lack of involvement and respect for our professional space.

The reality is that to keep these programs vital and relevant, instructors need to maintain their relationships outside of the classroom. Thus, ironically, the teacher-as-mind-reader syndrome, which afflicted instructors in the most traditional companies – where they had no access – can return for different reasons in the most forward thinking of organizations.

Conclusion

Clearly, there are numerous influences affecting workplace teachers that come from beyond their classroom walls. Understanding where an organization fits into the traditional–high performance continuum can provide workplace ESL educators with a framework to help them learn how to approach individual contracts. By knowing the broader goals and aspirations of the business, instructors can better plan how their courses will fit into the larger organizational structure they will temporarily join while teaching on-site.

Thus, when a company decides to set up an on-site ESL program, the teacher and the business need to understand how that program will be related to the organization as a whole. Regardless of where the company falls on the traditional–high performance continuum, the provider will probably need to make a consistent effort to educate all levels of the organization about the nature of language learning, the relative slowness of the process, and the need for support from the native English speaking population. In addition, the teacher will often need to reframe the language "problems" of nonnative speakers as an organizational need for improved communication among all employees.

In traditional companies, the teacher is likely to be bound by more definitive goals (i.e., improving pronunciation, refining telephone skills, etc.) than those identified for high performance organizations. Providers in

this type of organization can expect to conduct a limited needs assessment with a narrow focus that can be correlated to measurable gains or changes in how an employee communicates. The traditional company is less likely to spend resources on a full scale assessment; however, if the program is being funded through outside sources (i.e., a federal workplace literacy grant), the company may have to comply with the terms of the grant by participating in a thorough assessment process. As stated previously in this paper, ESL courses in these organizations are unlikely to be institutionalized, and, in general, will focus on helping employees to do their current jobs more effectively.

Because transitional organizations are in a state of flux, they are the least predictable, and for this reason, while they are very commonplace, they may also be the most difficult to work with. Organizations of this type may have an individual, a department, or representatives in upper level management that support workplace education in general and ESL in particular for their employees. At the same time, however, other large pockets of the organization may not share or even be aware of their views, and the teacher may therefore be met with lots of contradictory information about the need and support for teaching ESL on-site.

Consequently, teachers in transitional organizations need to search out those managers and supervisors who can help champion the program to not only give them greater insight into the workings of the organization but also advocate for the educational process and its long-term benefits to all employees.

Organizations approaching high performance already understand the intrinsic value of becoming *learning organizations*, places where on-going education is valued for all employees because these companies recognize the relationship between continuous learning and their ability to improve continuously as a result. ESL educators in companies such as these have fewer challenges in regard to helping organizations acknowledge the benefits of providing educational opportunities for all employees.

Here, however, teachers need to remember that while the company may have a philosophy that supports on-going learning, many individuals within the organization will not have an understanding about the ways in which language learning differs from other types of training. Though the environment may be favorable to running an ESL program, the teacher needs to be responsible for clarifying what results can realistically be achieved through on-site classes. This is true for on-site ESL programs within any organization. In addition, these organizations may not readily understand why the teacher has an on-going need to maintain relationships with managers and supervisors once the program is established.

To keep classes current and to stay abreast of the company's often changing internal dynamics, teachers should not allow themselves to become isolated once a program is underway even though the organization may assume the program is ready to run itself at this point. By staying in touch, instructors will be able to demonstrate how the teaching of English is one piece in the larger education and development process that fosters organizational change. Through this process, the organization will be better able to tap their nonnative English speaking employees as resources and value the contributions of this population.

By coming to understand how an organization perceives itself, by having a lens through which to view that organization, and by helping to educate the business about language learning and the complexities of communication, the workplace ESL teacher can produce positive results within that organization. Unlike teachers in other settings, a teacher in the workplace needs to develop and maintain rapport with supervisors and managers who will be measuring the program's success not only by observing changes in the communication skills of their employees, but also through their sense of the instructor's credibility outside of the classroom.

Finally, it is not enough to ask about the outside influences affecting workplace teachers. While this information is vitally important, it has a necessary corollary that quality educators will not ignore. Workplace teachers must not only be respondents to company and employee needs. They must also be advocates for the multicultural employees they serve, educating the people around them about ways in which they can extend and refine their own communication skills so that the burden of change does not fall unduly on a single segment of the workplace population – nonnative English speakers. ■

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to the following ESL educators for their time and willingness to share their thoughts and experiences about teaching in the workplace with us: Susan Burke, Mission College; Venette Cook, College of Extended Learning, San Francisco State University; Kathleen Corley, College of Extended Learning, San Francisco State University; Kelly Greer, Strategy; Oscar Ramirez, Career Resources Development Center; Laurie Winfield, College of Extended Learning, San Francisco State University; and Dovie Wylie, On-Site English. A special thanks goes to Kathleen Corley for her valuable support and feedback in the revising of this paper.

References

Alamprese, J. (1993). The worker, work, and workplace literacy: Missing links. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(3), 553-555.

Andrews, D. (1990). ESL instruction in the workplace. *The CATESOL Journal, 3*,(1), 37-47.

Chisman, F.P. (1992). *The missing link: Workplace education in small business.* Washington, DC: The Southport Institute for Policy Analysis.

Ford, D. (1992). Toward a more literate workforce. *Training and Development, 11*, 53-57.

Hayflich, P.F., & Lomperis, A.E. (1992). Why don't they speak English? *Training, 29* (10), 75-78.

National Center on Education and the Economy's Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce. (1990). *America's choice: High skills or low wages!* Rochester, NY: National Center on Education and the Economy.

Reich, R.B., (1992). *The work of nations.* New York: Vintage Books.

Sarmiento, A.R. (1991). Do literacy programs promote high skills or low wages? Suggestions for future evaluations of workplace programs. *Labor Notes*, pp. 2-5.

Spruck Wrigley, H. (1991). *Evaluating workplace literacy programs, a tentative evaluation plan.* Unpublished manuscript.

Stein, S. (1991). *Tradition and change: The role of workplace education in the transformation of the workplace.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of Adult Continuing Education, Montreal, Canada.

Stein, S., & Sperazi, L. (1990). *Workplace education in context: A chart comparing traditional and high performance work organizations.* Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse.

The CATESOL Journal

REVIEW

The Missing Link: Workplace Education in Small Business
Forrest Chisman.
Washington, DC: The Southport Institute for Policy Analysis. 1992.

The Workplace Literacy Primer: An Action Manual for Training and Development Professionals
William J. Rothwell and Dale C. Brandenburg.
Amherst, MA: Human Resources Development Press. 1990.

JOHN WILEY
Career Resources Development Center, San Francisco
and
MARJI KNOWLES
Mission Community College

In ESL, more than any other field of language learning, the range of ideas which represent current practices in teaching, research, and theory is a vibrant, sometimes volatile mix of sociopolitical concerns, public policy issues, and linguistic/pedagogical research. Because this range of disciplines informs ESL teaching practice, the ESL instructor can choose from a wide variety of teaching resources. In the nascent practice of workplace ESL, the field of business management and administration also has an obvious, substantial influence upon instruction and theory.

The primary teaching resources coming from the business world for workplace ESL instructors take the form of generalized how-to manuals for human resources and training professionals, which barely touch upon ESL or language training. *The Workplace Literacy Primer* falls into this category. The other book reviewed in this article, *The Missing Link: Workplace Education in Small Business*, looks at workplace education from not a business, but a public policy standpoint. Thus, these two books provide the ESL instructor with two different and nonpedagogical perspectives on workplace instruction.

The Workplace Literacy Primer is, as it is subtitled, an action manual for training and development professionals. As such, it provides a means for

ESLers to understand what human resource (HR) people do: their role in an organization, what they must do to get a training program off the ground, their jargon. Part 1 of *The Workplace Literacy Primer* briefly defines the problem of adult literacy on a national scale and shows how to recognize basic skills problems in an organization through a needs assessment. Part 2 helps the HR person figure out how to address those problems discovered through the needs assessment. Parts 3 through 6 show how to set up, operate, and evaluate an in-house training program.

Being a manual, this book reads like a university textbook. All the ideas are laid out precisely and repeatedly; each chapter has an overview, "application activities" (also known as exercises), and endnotes. Dozens of models, charts, flowcharts, graphs, and survey results provide the reader with plenty of visual reinforcement. This book provides readers with a good, if rather pedantic, understanding of how training and development professionals view (or are supposed to view) workplace literacy and basic skills training. However presented, this kind of knowledge is critical for anyone in the field of workplace literacy training.

In addition, the book provides some thought-provoking nuggets of information within the vast groves of "exhibits" (all that visual stuff), most gleaned from already well-known publications such as *The Bottom Line* and *Workforce 2000*, that are of interest to ESLers. There is a brief discussion of the legalities of pre-employment testing. (It's legal – with certain exceptions. Is language testing okay?) Numerous surveys are cited. In one, HR professionals rated the relative importance of various reasons for offering in-house training. (The most important reason was to "improve the organization's ability to respond to technological change." How would one achieve this goal in the context of an ESL workplace class?) The most common skill taught in basic skills courses, according to one survey, is not reading, writing, or math, but listening. (What's the difference between teaching listening skills to native speakers and nonnative speakers?) Exemplary, established, basic-skill programs by well-known companies have three things in common. They are: (a) delivered on the employees' own time, (b) offered more by educators than by in-house trainers, and (c) organized more by elementary or secondary grade level and subject matter than by subject or job-related activities. (How does this jibe with your own experience?) In addition to the numerous studies and surveys quoted, this book lists many kinds of organizations involved in the field and commercially available training materials.

The Workplace Literacy Primer serves much the same purpose as a general ESL text: It doesn't directly address the teaching of ESL in the workplace, but it does have within it some potentially useful ideas and informa-

tion that the workplace ESL professional can adapt to his/her own situation. Sound familiar?

The Missing Link is a summary report of an 18-month study of formal employer-sponsored basic skills (or workforce literacy) instruction in small and medium-sized firms, conducted by the Southport Institute for Policy Analysis, a think-tank based in Washington, DC. Thus, rather than describe, as *The Workplace Literacy Primer* does, what should be done and how, *The Missing Link* tries to describe what is being done and how it is being done. In addition, *The Workplace Literacy Primer* focuses on developing training programs for large corporations (500 employees or more); *The Missing Link*, as described above, focuses on smaller companies.

According to the author, Forrest Chisman, *The Missing Link* focuses on the gap between "the need and demand for workplace education and the supply" (p. 14). Noting that currently only 3% to 5% of small and medium-sized businesses are providing training for their employees and 20% to 30% want to implement such programs at their companies, Chisman writes that the challenge is to take what has been done at the 3% to 5% and make it happen at those companies that want it – "in such a way that the distinctive character of workplace education as a system for building both better workers and better firms is not lost (p. 14)." This can be done, he says, "by stimulating the public-private partnerships that are at the heart of the small business approach" (p. 14). Chisman devotes the rest of the book to an overview of the different types of workplace education programs currently being used, an analysis of why some businesses have implemented workplace education programs while others haven't, an overview of the providers of workplace education programs, and finally, a model for a federal role in workplace education – as he calls it, "A Federal Initiative To Create A New Partnership For Workplace Education" (p. 106). Chisman's message resonates throughout the entire report: This is a new, worker-centered orientation towards workplace education, one which mirrors the change in work organization which many small companies have already implemented and which should be nurtured and promoted by the federal government.

In advocating the involvement of the federal government in workplace education, Chisman specifically recommends that the federal government provide a "core" of experienced workplace educators to address problems of "market failure, quality, and funding at every level" (p. 106). Drawing an analogy with the Cooperative Extension Service, an agricultural program started in 1914 to help small farmers increase the productivity of their yields, Chisman envisions the creation of a federal Office of Workplace Education, as well as similar state offices, to be partners with small businesses in establishing workplace education programs.

While the idea of expanding the size of the federal and state bureaucracies may not be everyone's cup of tea, Chisman's ideas are clearly worthy of serious consideration and debate, particularly in California, which faces enormous challenges in improving both the educational system and the economic climate.

So, are these two books useful? Yes, and for different reasons. *The Workplace Literacy Primer* helps one gain insight into the way training professionals are taught to think about workplace literacy programs. *The Missing Link* gives one a clearer view of what is actually happening out there and more specifically addresses the issues and concerns that are relevant to the ESL workplace educator. ■

The CATESOL Journal

REVIEW

Language and Discrimination: A Study of Communication in Multiethnic Workplaces

C. Roberts, E. Davies, and T. Jupp. London: Longman. 1992.

MARY McGROARTY
Northern Arizona University

Have you wondered, as I have, what became of Britain's National Centre for Industrial Language Training (NCILT) projects, the efforts that produced the now-classic videotape *Crosstalk* (Twitchin, 1979), a staple of North American cross-cultural and sociolinguistics courses since the 1980s? This provocative volume presents "the rest of the story," a comprehensive and insightful account of the rise and demise of NCILT's collaborative training efforts involving ESL professionals, employers, training institutions, and nonnative English-speaking workers in Britain from the mid-1970s to mid-1980s.

This book is well worthwhile for ESL professionals (and any other audiences concerned with workplace training and worker relations) for several reasons. First, from a theoretical and practical standpoint, is the insistence that linguistic and cross-cultural training be reciprocal, involving all parties, not just the relatively powerless workers or learners. This is a refreshing change from past studies of workplace training, which often reflected solely the institutional interests of employers and the views of the dominant culture (Hull, 1993). To get a good orientation to the broad social context motivating the NCILT projects, it is useful to read chapters 1, a general overview of issues in language and discrimination, and 6, the conclusion, in which the authors assess the social context and overall impact of the project, before reading the other chapters, which describe some of the linguistic and educational topics in more detail.

Chapter 6 shows that, as NCILT continued, program designers developed greater insights and more appropriate methods for balancing the perspectives of the participants served with those of the diverse teachers, sponsors, and funding agencies which participated. Their candid admission that many of the paths of action taken by NCILT were relatively unplanned at

the start, and their honesty regarding the constraints affecting program development will ring true to the experience of anyone who has ever attempted to implement a real life language project. Throughout the volume, the authors disavow overly simple, linear models of curriculum design and program implementation and thus reflect current scholarship regarding the messiness, dynamism, and blurred boundaries (or "indeterminate zones of practice" [Schön, 1987, p. 6]) of human problem-solving activities.

Chapter 2 provides a careful consideration of several available scholarly approaches (e.g., ethnography, social semiotics, pragmatics, discourse analysis) – each with its advantages and disadvantages – toward the practical issues of gathering and analyzing data on worker selection and workplace communication which arose during the course of the project. This chapter by itself is a welcome answer to the question of what various disciplines can and cannot offer to practitioners and service providers engaged in addressing real world problems. It documents the project teams' engagement with current developments in all the fields they drew upon as they went about planning and delivering services to program participants, who were, in the main, unemployed (or *redundant*, as the term is used in Britain) Black and Asian workers in Britain's industrial Midlands.

Chapters 3, 4, and 5 offer fuller descriptions of how planners, teachers, and participants proceeded to identify and then deal with issues of cross-cultural and linguistic misunderstanding in the workplace through pedagogical interventions. NCILT courses went well beyond the usual general cross-cultural training programs in several ways by (a) spending time (up to a full week, far shorter than a traditional ethnography but much longer than allowed in many workplace training projects [McGroarty & Scott, 1993]) doing participant observations as a means of needs assessment in relevant settings; (b) hiring and collaborating with professional service providers and instructors who spoke the languages of the participants; and (c) paying close attention to how communicative exchanges were evaluated by all parties involved, not just by employers and supervisors. This latter effort led to the establishment of training programs that were more specifically suited to the situations of various groups of workers and, equally significant, explicit training in antiracist interviewing procedures for government service providers.

Chapter 4 demonstrates NCILT's dual-track approach to analysis of ethnographic data, with consideration of overarching matters of conflicting cultural schemata, expectations, and assumptions, coupled with a closer, but still selective, examination of specific linguistic features (i.e., prosody, syntax, and lexis). Some miscommunications were indeed caused by different uses of the latter features, particularly prosody, but far more often the mis-

match of culturally based expectations regarding roles and behavior played a larger role in creating and maintaining communicative barriers.

Chapter 5 focuses directly on language teaching and learning through summaries of four different NCILT projects related to addressing the needs of intermediate-level learners, developing student autonomy, linking language classes more closely to occupational skill training, and preparing bilingual staff. Discussion of the relative success of programs to promote learner autonomy was particularly interesting. Both teachers and students were unfamiliar with the premises and methods of self-directed learning, indicating once more that authoritarian classroom expectations and participation structures are as deeply rooted in workplace training as in other educational institutions.

For North American readers, slightly more explicit orientation to the data and to the research context would have been useful. Even with consistent use of standard transcription conventions, it is difficult to derive a sense of exactly how language functioned to discriminate against nonnative speakers in a few of the many transcripts included. As the authors note, much crucial information is carried by either intonation or implicature; for Americans unfamiliar with conventional British intonation, it is not entirely clear what, precisely, made nonnative speakers of English feel demeaned by a particular speech segment. (The authors are careful to acknowledge the extremely subtle nature and interactive effect of the cues studied. One wishes for an accompanying cassette or video to get a firmer grasp of the interpretation of data here. In a time-honored southern California tradition, I suggest it is high time for *Crosstalk II* to accompany this book.) More extensive discussion of the relationship of workers and union stewards to management in the British industries studied would also assist North American readers in understanding whether and how labor organizations contributed to training efforts, though authors do report that the influence of British unions waned greatly during the period under study. Additionally, more information about the types of adult education available (or unavailable) to members of minority language groups outside their workplaces would help readers on this side of the Atlantic grasp the extent of educational alternatives available, either through classes or self-access education centers, for workers who did not have access to NCILT, which was implemented in selected sites rather than nation wide.

These are minor quibbles, though, for this is an ambitious volume that succeeds in thoughtfully summarizing and critiquing more than a decade of high-level professional effort informed by sociolinguistic sophistication and genuine social commitment. The short bibliographic essays at the end of each chapter, the extensive bibliography, and the thorough index make the

book a valuable resource for researchers as well as teachers. Language professionals and the many other audiences of service providers, policy makers, and community advocates interested in workplace language must take the findings and cautions of *Language and Discrimination* to heart to advance the field. This book is a landmark both because of the scope of the project it reports and the even-handed presentation of the theories, data, analyses, and assumptions driving the effort. The occupationally stratified and linguistically diverse multiethnic workplaces considered here are ubiquitous in California and in most large cities of the industrialized world. It behooves language professionals to see what projects such as NCILT can and cannot do to promote equity, harmony, and autonomy in workplaces and in workers' lives. Through publication of this book, the authors have enabled ESL professionals to learn from NCILT's many successes, few failures, and, more importantly, its efforts to develop imaginative approaches to workplace training. No one interested in language and workplace training can ignore their considerable achievements. ■

References

Hull, G. (1993). Hearing other voices: A critical assessment of popular views on literacy and work. *Harvard Educational Review, 63*(1), 20-49.

McGroarty, M., & Scott, S. (1993). *Workplace ESL instruction: Varieties and constraints.* (EDO-LE-93-07). Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for ESL Literacy Education.

Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Twitchin, J. (Producer). (1979). *Crosstalk.* [Videotape]. Wilmette, IL: Films, Inc.

The CATESOL Journal REVIEW

Immigrant America: A Portrait

Alejandro Portes and Ruben G. Rumbaut.
Berkeley: University of California Press. 1990.

KATHERYN GARLOW
Palomar College

> When it comes to immigrants, the mood is getting ugly ... Jobs are scarce and as the U.S. economy sputters, people accuse foreigners of stealing paychecks from Americans ... Anger is heating to a fever pitch in California where citizens' groups are calling for a crackdown on further immigration. Meanwhile politicians vow to seal U.S. borders and halt the flood of newcomers. (Getlin, 1993, p. E4)

In this climate of economic scarcity and rising anti-immigrant sentiment, we ESL teachers and administrators in all educational segments must serve the needs of our students. It behooves us, therefore, to gain some understanding of the complexities of contemporary immigration and a perspective on what the past has taught us to expect.

Portes and Rumbaut's *Immigrant America: A Portrait* provides a valuable analysis of the complexities concerning immigration that differs from simplistic public perceptions. In the preface, the authors state that their aim is to make accessible to the general public a comprehensive and comprehensible synthesis of the major aspects of the literature on immigration. The book focuses on the diversity of today's immigrants' origins and contexts of exit from their home countries, as well as the diversity of their adaptation experiences and contexts of reception into American society.

The book consists of seven chapters. It begins with a discussion of who the immigrants are and where they come from, including a typology of present-day immigrants that provides a framework for the authors' analyses of their processes of economic, political, social, cultural and psychological adaptation. The second chapter examines their points of destination and patterns of settlement, and the formation and function of new ethnic com-

munities in urban America. Chapter 3 looks at the incorporation of immigrants in the American economy and seeks to explain differences in education, occupation, entrepreneurship, and income by examining not only immigrants' resources and skills but specific government policies, labor market conditions and characteristics of various ethnic communities. Chapter 4 analyzes immigrant politics, including the underlying questions of identity, loyalty, and determinants of current patterns of naturalization among newcomers who are "in the society but not yet of it" (pp. 95-96). Chapter 5 focuses on the emotional consequences of migration and acculturation and the major determinants of immigrants' psychological responses to their changed circumstances.

Of particular interest to language teachers is Chapter 6, "Learning the Ropes," which provides a detailed discussion of English acquisition, the loss or maintenance of bilingualism across generations, and new data on the educational attainment of diverse groups of migrants in American public schools. The goal of the concluding chapter is to clarify the origins of today's undocumented immigrants and to assess their effects on America in the future.

This book not only contains a wealth of information about current immigrants and an analysis of what they mean to America, but also challenges the common media clichés and widespread stereotypes. These public perceptions often contribute to the xenophobic fears which fuel political agendas of nativist groups and also often affect the various contexts in which we ESL teachers do our work.

The authors present research findings which refute such public perceptions as the following:

1. It is only desperate poverty, squalor and unemployment in the sending countries which propels people to America.
2. Only the people with the least skills immigrate to the United States.
3. Concentrations of immigrants will lead to separatism and cultural alienation.
4. Undocumented immigration stems solely from the economic needs of the immigrants.
5. Immigrants steal low wage jobs from citizens, particularly minorities, or they cause wages to be lowered because they will work for less money.

One popular nostrum with which we ESL teachers are all familiar is that English should be the official language of the United States because of the fear that the preeminence of English is being threatened by other lan-

guages, particularly Spanish. Research findings reported in the book indicate, on the contrary, that native language monolingualism rarely outlasts the first generation, that English monolingualism is the dominant trend among the second generation, and that maintenance of fluent bilingualism is the exception which depends on the intellectual and economic resources of the parents and social supports like an ethnic enclave. The authors point out the irony that, although foreign language fluency is an asset and a scarce one at that in the United States, preserving the languages of immigrants is seen as a threat and so is not supported by the society at large.

ESL teachers should particularly take note of the common assumption that acculturation has generally been considered to have beneficial consequences for the economic progress and psychological well-being of immigrants. Portes and Rumbaut present contradictory findings. For example, a study of Mexican immigrants, native-born Mexican-Americans, and non-Spanish whites in California's Santa Clara Valley found that a pervasive sense of cultural heritage was positively related to mental health and social well-being among both immigrants and native Mexican-Americans. Another study found that the higher the level of acculturation or "Americanization," the greater the prevalence of such disorders as alcohol and drug abuse or dependence, phobia, and antisocial personality.

The last chapter includes some sensible recommendations for immigration policy concerning the various types of immigrants previously discussed, such as manual labor migrants, professionals and entrepreneurs, and refugees and asylees. The authors conclude that "clearly, the United States cannot be the last place of refuge for everyone in need, and in this sense some form of control is well justified. However, restrictionists' gloomy rhetoric concerning all present immigration is likely to prove as groundless as in the past ... Although problems and struggles are inevitable along the way, in the long run the diverse talents and energies of newcomers will reinforce the vitality of American society and the richness of its culture." (p. 246)

For those who are stimulated to delve further into the topic, the 23-page bibliography is a good resource. ■

References

Getlin, J. (1993, October 3). Reluctant welcome. *Los Angeles Times*, pp. E1, E4, E5.

The CATESOL Journal

REVIEW

Language Planning and Social Change

Robert L. Cooper. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1989.

ERIKA L. KONRAD
Northern Arizona University

Language planning may seem like something done only by high-ranking political officials. However, language planning or the implementation of those plans is carried out by teachers' associations (Bamgbose, 1989) and by individual language teachers whenever they choose a text (Tollefson, 1991), administer a proficiency exam, make decisions on which variety of English to teach (Nelson, 1985) or how to treat the learner's native language in the classroom. ESL teachers in particular know firsthand that learner problems are not strictly language problems but are related to the history that each learner brings to school – the political and economic forces that bring them to our classrooms and their struggle to find a new way of life amongst neighbors who may or may not espouse cultural and linguistic pluralism as a core value (Smolicz, 1980). Therefore, for ESL/EFL instructors or trainees who have an interest in how language planning and social change are interconnected, who are curious about how learner motivation is affected by forces beyond the classroom, and who desire to get a more global perspective of their profession, this book is a valuable resource.

As an introduction to the field of language planning, Cooper's work is designed not specifically for the TESOL professional but for anyone with an interest in language. In fact, Cooper's presentation presupposes no prior knowledge of sociology or linguistics. Nevertheless, it is scholarly in nature and would be appropriate for a graduate-level course in sociolinguistics for future TESOL professionals.

In the first chapter, Cooper uses four examples to show that language planning is never carried out in a vacuum nor is it ever carried out for purely linguistic purposes. The first example is that of the circumstances behind the founding of the Académie Française. For those who have little time or inclination to follow, much less comprehend, the connection between politics and language policy decisions, this is an accessible account of the very

human elements that go into these decisions. The second example is that of the promotion of Hebrew in Palestine – a language planning success story – and the factors that led to the flourishing of this language for everyday life. Following this is the example of the feminist movement in the United States and its efforts to reduce sexist usage of language such as androcentric generics. Cooper outlines the historical events and social climate surrounding this movement, which is still in progress. Indeed, this movement is one of the areas that affects the English teacher directly in her or his decisions about teaching such things as generic pronouns and names for professions. Finally, Cooper traces the history of the language situation in Ethiopia from the fourth century A.D. to the revolution in the 1970s, giving us another example of how the course of human events is affected by language and its inextricable links with mass movements and group identity.

The second chapter of the book is devoted to a thorough coverage of no less than 13 different definitions of language planning. The third and fourth chapters deal with frameworks for language planning in which Cooper presents four analogies for describing the workings of language planning: (a) as an instance of innovation management, (b) as a type of marketing, (c) as a tool in the acquisition and maintenance of power, and (d) as an example of decision making. The organization of this chapter is hard to follow, but Cooper gives the reader a helpful outline at the end. In fact, if you believe that language is solely a tool for communication, chapter 4 will give you some reasons to reevaluate your position.

Chapters 5, 6, and 7 present definitions and many examples of three different kinds of language planning: status planning, corpus planning, and acquisition planning. For example, status planning – the allocation of function to particular language varieties – is seen in the declaration of statutory official status of English in California in 1986. Those involved in bilingual education will be particularly interested in this chapter, as will those who are working to secure the linguistic rights of language minorities (Ruiz, 1984). Corpus planning, Cooper explains, involves standardization, modernization, and the reduction of language into written form. This chapter is particularly helpful in demonstrating both the need for a standard and the transitory and arbitrary nature of such standards. EFL teachers and curriculum designers will find Cooper's historical background on the English language helpful in making decisions about whose English to teach and whose standard to enforce (Nelson, 1985).

Classroom language teachers and administrators will find that the chapter on acquisition planning relates directly to them, while the last chapter on social change is a good introduction to the various theories developed in the field of sociology to explain how and why societies

change. This last chapter of the text may be of help in empowering TESOL professionals who feel ignorant of the sociopolitical processes that bring learners to them and that influence bureaucrats in making policy decisions that teachers and administrators find difficult to implement.

Cooper also includes an index to topics, languages, and countries mentioned in the book. For example, for those of us concerned and confused about the situation in the former Yugoslavia, there are entries on Serbo-Croatian and Bosnian. The Vietnam War, the Spanish language, and the former Soviet Union are also represented. Due to the introductory nature of the book, however, some of the treatments of language situations are not as detailed as others. In addition, some of the language situations described by Cooper have changed since 1989, when this text was published. In light of this, further work like Cooper's – on learners' historical and cultural backgrounds – is needed in order to provide deeper insights into the dynamics of multicultural classrooms and design policies and programs that take into account the connections between language and culture. ■

References

Bamgbose, A. (1989). Issues for a model of language planning. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 13*(1), 24-33.

Nelson, C. (1985). My language, your culture: Whose communicative competence? *World Englishes, 4*(2), 243-250.

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal, 8*(2), 15-34.

Smolicz, J. (1980). Language as a core value of culture. *RELC Journal, 11*(1), 1-13.

Tollefson, J. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality.* New York: Longman.

The CATESOL Journal

REVIEW

Planning Language, Planning Inequality

James W. Tollefson. New York: Longman. 1991.

SUSAN CONRAD
Northern Arizona University

Enthusiasm, appreciation, perturbation, anger – rarely has a language book engendered the diversity of strong reactions that I have heard expressed in discussions of Tollefson's *Planning Language, Planning Inequality*. Although several recent publications have emphasized the political nature of language planning (e.g., Coulmas, 1993/1994; Luke, McHoul, & Mey, 1990), few are as clearly written and accessible to nonspecialists as is Tollefson's book – and it is precisely because it causes such diverse and sometimes uncomfortable reactions that the book is valuable reading for anyone involved in language teaching or program administration.

The main aim of the book is to show that language planning is inherently ideological and that language policies are used to maintain or further social inequalities. Tollefson argues that, despite the energy and resources put into language teaching, our language policies are driven by systems which ensure that millions of people will not be able to acquire the language competence necessary for social and economic success. As Tollefson puts it

> ...while modern social and economic systems require certain kinds of language competence, they simultaneously create conditions which ensure that vast numbers of people will be unable to acquire that competence. A central mechanism by which this process occurs is language policy. (p. 7)

The strength of the book – and the primary reason for positive reactions to it – lies in the variety of contexts Tollefson uses to support his main point. Eight different countries are included in the discussions. Furthermore, the book's chapters are structured in such a way as to present the major issues from a variety of perspectives. In addition to analyses of national situations, the chapters include five other useful features. First, case studies give concrete and more personal examples of the issues being addressed. In addition, media examples are used to extend the issues to dif-

ferent contexts, with excerpts ranging from United Nations resolutions to the *TESOL Newsletter*. At the end of each chapter, the "For Discussion" section raises some provocative points and suggests activities such as comparing the ideologies underlying certain textbooks, while the "For Action" section encourages observations, interviews, and visits to schools or agencies to discover more about the local situation. Finally, each chapter concludes with brief annotations of related readings.

The book is divided into eight chapters, with the first two chapters providing background information. Chapter 1 introduces the main idea of the book with discussion of language use in the United States and Namibia and defines terms from social theory, such as *power* and *hegemony*, which are important in later chapters. Chapter 2 contrasts two approaches to analyzing language situations – the *neoclassical approach*, which emphasizes the role of the individual and attributes any lack of success in a language to the individual's motivation and choices, and the *historical-structural approach*, which emphasizes social, political, and economic factors which shape a given context and constrain individuals' choices. Tollefson applies the latter approach in subsequent chapters in order to explain language policies and their consequences.

Chapters 3 to 7 comprise the heart of the book, each giving a different perspective on ideology and language planning. Chapter 3 focuses on mother tongue maintenance and second language learning in England, highlighting the "monolingual ideology" (p. 43) of both government reports and theories of language behavior. Chapter 4 then examines situations in which English is promoted as a tool for modernization, though it actually serves to maintain inequalities in society; Iran and China are used to demonstrate contrasting attitudes towards English. Issues of migration and language policies are discussed in chapter 5, in which Tollefson argues that U.S. education policies for refugees and immigrants ensure that they will stay in marginalized, low-paying jobs. Chapter 6 investigates the situation in the Philippines to show how English as a second language can also serve to benefit those established in power, just as does English as a native language for powerful groups in other countries. Finally, chapter 7 discusses countries where language rights have been protected. Australia is presented as a more stable example, and Yugoslavia is used to show that the protection of rights requires constant struggle, with their withdrawal leading to crisis. Though the description of this crisis is outdated, it does provide useful background on events which dominate international news today.

Chapter 8 provides the conclusion to the book, reviewing its main points and adding critiques of language policy research and language policies in the workplace. The ability to use one's own language at work is

emphasized as central to a democratic system; however, the discussion of language at work is surprisingly brief considering the importance Tollefson attributes to it.

In addition to the variety of contexts presented, another strength of the book is that it goes beyond large-scale language planning situations and includes issues related to language acquisition research and pedagogy. Most useful for teachers and materials writers is likely to be chapter 4. The issue of modernization is expanded to discuss many language teachers' desires to empower their students, and Tollefson critically assesses common communicative and humanistic techniques used to do this. His conclusion is that many activities, such as personal discussion, are actually counter to the empowerment goal, and like other language policies, give "an illusion of progress that may help to sustain unequal social relationships" (p. 101). This conclusion may be one reason for some readers' uncomfortable reactions to the book, but raising this issue and asking teachers to examine their practices is certainly a useful contribution.

By the end of the book, it is difficult to argue with Tollefson's statement that, "... language policy is inseparable from the relationships of power that divide societies" (p. 203). However, the weakness of the book – and the reason for many negative reactions – lies in a lack of thorough discussion of what realistically can be done to change situations. Nowhere are concrete, realistic alternatives given for the unjust language policies which are described. Although promoting awareness may be Tollefson's goal, the lack of serious alternatives weakens the impact the book can have.

In the chapter about mother tongue maintenance, for example, Tollefson uses the case study of Harib, a child from Bangladesh, who is attending school in England. Harib speaks Bengali and Sylheti already but is pressured by teachers and other students to use English at school. Tollefson criticizes the situation: "The alternative that might be best for Harib – for his teachers and friends to learn Bengali or Sylheti – is not considered" (p. 78). Such an "alternative," however, is not truly an alternative. Even readers sympathetic to Tollefson's point can see that learning the language of every immigrant child who comes to the school would be an impossible task for teachers. For readers who are not sympathetic, a suggestion such as this and the lack of other, workable alternatives makes it too easy to dispense with the book as unrealistic liberal ideology. Tollefson thus misses the chance to be truly persuasive with people who are skeptical of his ideas or who appreciate the ideas but are skeptical of their practical implementation.

Despite its shortcomings, however, Tollefson's book is valuable reading. It presents a great deal of information about language policies in the U.S.

and other countries, and convincingly makes the point that ideology is part of language planning. A reader's reaction may be enthusiastic adoption of Tollefson's ideas and appreciation that the political nature of language has been openly discussed, or it may be anger and frustration at criticism of existing programs and the lack of concrete alternatives – or it may include both of these. Whatever the reaction, however, the book is bound to be effective in meeting one of Tollefson's aims: to facilitate language professionals' exploration of the ideology behind their activities and theories and to encourage them to make their values explicit. Reading and discussing *Planning Language, Planning Inequality* does promote clarification of one's own values and one's beliefs about the best language policies for a classroom or program, as well as for larger regional, national, and international contexts. ■

References

Coulmas, F. (1993/1994). Language policy and planning: Political perspectives. In W. Grabe (Ed.), *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 14,* 34-52.

Luke, A., McHoul, A.W., & Mey, J.L. (1990). On the limits of language planning: Class, state and power. I.R. Baldauf, Jr. & A. Luke (Eds.), *Language planning and education in Australasia and the South Pacific* (pp. 25-44). Clereden, England: Multilingual Matters.

The CATESOL Journal

GUEST EDITORS

Anne Katz is the site coordinator for the Evaluation Assistance Center-West at ARC Associates. EAC-West provides technical assistance in evaluation and assessment issues to Title VII projects and schools serving English language learners. A former teacher in both the U.S. and Brazil, she has research interests in second language writing development and effective schooling for language minority students. She is coauthor of *Reforming the Debate: The Roles of Native Languages in English-Only Programs for Language Minority Students.*

Tamara Lucas is a senior research associate at the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST) at Teachers College, Columbia University. She became director of the DEWEY Network (Diversity and Excellence Working for the Education of Youth) at NCREST in August, 1994. She has been involved in the education of linguistically and culturally diverse students for 16 years in California as a teacher, staff developer, administrator, and researcher. From 1991 to 1994, she was the director of the Multifunctional Resource Center (MRC) for Northern California, providing assistance to schools and districts with English language learners. She is coauthor of *Promoting the Success of Latino Language Minority Students: An Exploratory Study of Six High Schools* and *Reframing the Debate: The Roles of Native Languages in English-Only Programs for Language Minority Students.*

CONTRIBUTORS

Tim Beard is an education specialist with the Multifunctional Resource Center in Oakland. He has worked as a bilingual teacher, folklorist, and staff developer and serves as the coordinator of the Sequoia Teachers Network, the Foxfire affiliate in northern California.

Cherry Campbell is program head of English Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies. She teaches adjunct and content-based research writing courses for graduate students in international management and political science, and trains TESOL graduate students in the teaching of writing.

Susan Conrad, a doctoral student in applied linguistics at Northern Arizona University, has taught ESL in Africa, Korea, and the United States.

Martha Clark Cummings teaches in both the English Studies and TESOL programs at the Monterey Institute of International Studies. She is coauthor, with Jean Withrow and Gay Brookes, of *Changes*, a reader for ESL writers.

Lois Facer is a program developer at Mission College, Santa Clara, in the Office of Corporate Training and Economic Development. She specializes in workplace programs which include ESL, English, and math.

Katherine Garlow has an MA in linguistics and for more than 20 years has taught at Palomar College in San Marcos. A past CATESOL president, she has also taught at the Binational Center in Bogota, Colombia.

Lynn Goldstein is an associate professor of applied linguistics and TESOL at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, where she trains TESOL teachers and directs the campus-wide writing program.

As a faculty member at San Francisco State University, **Kate Kinsella** has conducted faculty development workshops throughout the state to assist secondary and higher education faculty in responding to the needs of their linguistically and culturally diverse students. An experienced teacher at both the secondary and postsecondary levels, she is also a consultant with the Multifunctional Resource Center, Northern California.

Marji Knowles, director of the Workplace Learning Resource Center at Mission Community College, is a former TESOL board member and has been an ESL professional for 20 years.

Erika Konrad worked in Japan for three years as an English teacher and teacher-trainer. Her MA in applied linguistics is from UC Davis, and she is currently working on her PhD at Northern Arizona University.

Mary McGroarty, associate professor in the applied linguistics program of the English Department at Northern Arizona University, has research and teaching interests in language policy, pedagogy, and assessment in cross-cultural settings. Her current work includes investigation of the use of languages other than English in the U.S. workplace and collaboration on a test of Navajo comprehension for young children.

Peter Roos, codirector of Multicultural Education, Training, and Advocacy (META), has been involved for more than 20 years in litigation and advocacy with regard to the rights of national origin minority and language minority students and their families. He has litigated a number of bilingual education cases around the country.

Katherine Davies Samway is a teacher educator at San Jose State University. She is interested in making her teaching at the university level consistent with what we know about effective teaching and learning.

Marguerite Ann Snow is associate professor at California State University, Los Angeles where she teaches in the TESOL MA program and codirects Project LEAP: Learning English for Academic Purposes, under a grant funded by the U.S. Department of Education. She is coauthor of *Content-Based Second Language Instruction* and coeditor of *The Multicultural Classroom: Readings for Content Area Teachers*.

Lauren A. Vanett directs the English Fluency Program at San Francisco State University Extended Education. She has been designing and implementing workplace ESL programs since 1987.

John Wiley is education coordinator for Project EXCEL, a federally funded workplace literacy program operated by the Career Resources Development Center, a nonprofit organization located in San Francisco. He has taught ESL in Japan and the Silicon Valley as well as in the manufacturing and hospitality industries in the Bay Area.